FBIS DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 018 28 January 1987

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Moscow TV's 24 Jan 'Studio 9' Program AA 1
[Zorin, Timothy Renton, Zhurkin, Bovin]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

TASS Reports on Reagan 'State of the Union Address A 1
'Crude Anti-Soviet Thrusts' Cited A 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Moscow World Service on Upcoming CPSU Plenum R 1
CPSU Central Committee Plenum Begins Work 27 Jan R 2
'Text' of Gorbachev Report R 2
Plenum Resumes R 48
Plenum Evaluated R 48

MOSCOW TV'S 24 JAN 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

OW240933 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0510 GMT 24 Jan 87

["Studio 9" presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Mr. Timothy Renton, UK minister of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs. Renton speaks in English with superimposed translation. Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer, are other members on the panel.]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We meet in Studio 9 at the Ostankino television center for our monthly program devoted to topical problems of international life. The problems today are very substantial and complex. We are not at an unusual moment in international politics. Much of what has been immobile is now in motion, many things are being reviewed and evaluated anew. Important foreign policy initiatives taken by the Soviet Union have played a great role in this area. A year ago, on 15 January 1986, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his statement outlined a concrete program for eliminating nuclear weapons throughout the world within a definite period of time, up to the year 2000. The proposals outlined by the Soviet leader laid down the beginnings for new initiatives, which in their totality amounted to a program for a substantial change for the better in the world political atmosphere.

The issue of most concern for all people on earth, irrespective of their political views, is how to remove the threat of nuclear war hanging over mankind. In today's Studio 9 discussion, we would like to assess the current situation, look at it from different points of view, and evaluate and compare these points of view. This will be made possible by the fact that one of the participants in our discussion today is a guest from Britain whom I would like to introduce to you -- Mr. Timothy Renton, minister of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs. Also taking part in our discussion are Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Aleksandr Yevgeneyevich Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer.

We say the past year was very significant in the international aspect. I propose to begin our discussion today with a question about the past year's characteristics and the legacy it has left us. I shall ask you, Vitaliy Vladimirovich, to begin.

[Zhurkin] First of all, it was a year which produced many hopes. It was also a year that produced quite a few disappointments. Summing up, however, I would say we ended the year by laying some kind of foundation for new hopes. I shall explain what I mean. For us Soviet people... of course we Soviet people link these hopes first of all with what our country has done during the year. That is normal. The main thing that started the year of hopes was the 15 January 1986 statement of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary which outlined a realistic, concrete, practical program for nuclear disarmament. It was not only a nuclear disarmament program. It included very concrete proposals aimed at chemical disarmament, for the destruction and banning of chemical weapons. It included concrete proposals for limiting and reducing conventional arms and a range of other issues. New radical approaches have been made in the sphere of control. It was accurately and clearly said that strict control is needed in arms limitations and reductions, even up to on-site inspection. The Soviet Union has practically implemented the program during the course of the year. The Soviet Union and its allies, in June in Budapest, outlined a very concrete and very detailed plan for limiting and reducing conventional arms.

Our leader arrived in Reykjavik with a very detailed, exceptionally large-scale, exceptionally far-reaching program for practically advancing the cause of preventing the transfer of the arms race into space, radically reducing strategic nuclear arms, reducing and subsequently eliminating intermediate-range nuclear missiles, and taking a serious approach to the problem of ending nuclear tests.

Unfortunately, we have to stir old problems. Reykjavik ended in failure. Reykjavik failed to produce positive results. At the same time, there were positive changes during the year when both sides found sufficient courage, energy, and determination to reject old approaches and approach problems in a new fashion. Problems were solved. For the first time the two sides spoke seriously about the most radical reductions of nuclear weapons, about nuclear disarmament. They still have arguments over these issues, there are different positions, but this subject is lying on the negotiating table. It has become something real, something practical. I think that in this sense, in the final balance, the past year was still a year of hopes.

[Zorin] Mr Minister, what could you say on this issue?

[Renton] I agree with many things Mr Zhurkin has just said, that a basis for more hope was laid in 1986. I think that this is the result of a movement forward after years of immobility and stagnation in the field of arms control. I have been given the honor of participating in today's program. I want to take this opportunity to say that I am very happy to participate in the Studio 9 program, to address an audience that I imagine amounts to about 120 million throughout the Soviet Union. I very much hope that some of these viewers also have the possibility of listening to our BBC programs in Russian from London. A day may come when there will be an international television service which will enable us to watch each other's television programs.

It is precisely in connection with the new interest in arms control that I am now in Moscow, and am taking part in this program at your invitation, for which I am very grateful. Mr Zhurkin and you have very correctly mentioned the beginning of the year, when the general secretary came out with his statement on 15 January, and also the summit meeting in Reykjavik. But I would particularly like to dwell at length on how the year ended.

At the end of November our prime minister, Mrs Thatcher, met President Reagan at Camp David in the United States. They evaluated what was discussed by the United States and the Soviet Union at the Reykjavik meeting. President Reagan and Mrs Thatcher came out with a very clear three-point program: a 50 percent reduction of U.S. and Soviet strategic arms, an agreement on increased intermediate or intermediate-range [povyshennoy promezhutochnoy ili sredney dalnosti] nuclear arms [Renton says in English: long-range intermediate nuclear weapons] -- which we in Great Britain would frankly like to see completely banned in Europe -- and a complete ban on chemical weapons.

We could call that our program for the coming 5 years. Because if we -- I am talking about powers possessing nuclear arms -- can achieve these three conditions, which are not connected to each other, in the next 5 years, that would represent the most substantial reduction of nuclear arms ever to have been achieved. And of course if we can manage to fully ban the terrible chemical weapons -- and we are ready to sign an agreement on this in the nearest future on condition that proper control is assured -- then the coming years will be positive and stirring in the field of arms control. I mention this as a step which brought the year 1986 to a close. This step was the statement made by President Reagan and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher at Camp David, in the United States, which is supported by all our NATO allies.

The United States and the Soviet Union have just resumed their talks in Geneva. I ardently hope that these talks will be productive. I know that you have appointed a new delegation leader with a very high rank to the talks. I hope that he and his U.S. partners will perform their roles to the fullest. But we and other countries like ours must also play a role. I had very interesting discussions on this issue with Secretary Dobrynin and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze [Renton says in English: in the last 2 days]. I hope that by the end of 1987, which has just started, we would, if we do not sign agreements, at least have prepared draft agreements which would take us closer to these concrete and attainable goals in the field of arms control which I have just mentioned. These agreements will not be just diplomatic papers. It is difficult to imagine anything that would more greatly affect the life of our children and grandchildren in your country and in mine than progress achieved in the attainment of these goals.

Just like Mr Zhurkin, I hope, I think that there is still a considerable amount of work to be done. I consider that the year 1986 saw the beginning of moving out from a difficult position in arms control. Now, in a spirit of goodwill, we must all develop this success from all sides in the year that has just begun.

[Zorin] Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, what can you say?

[Bovin] My general appraisal is about the same. Certainly, it was a year of hope and disappointment. It was a year which showed that agreement is possible, and at the same time has shown how difficult it is to reach agreement. However, when we speak about what has happened we are thinking about what will happen. This is most important for us. It is in this that the passing year has left a good inheritance for further progress.

However, it appears that when we think about this progress, perhaps we should think in terms of an overall picture of the events. When we start to discuss specific items, say chemical weapons, intermediate-range weapons in Europe, and a 50 percent reduction, then these are all elements of the total picture. In our point of view, in our approach to the problem, we feel that to work out some of the specific elements, it is necessary to see the total picture of how events are developing. First we must see where we are going, what all this is for. Fine, this is the first step, this is the second step. But a step in what direction?

This point of view is very important to us, and therefore I wish to emphasize the statement of Comrade Gorbachev, which specifically includes these separate steps into the general picture as we see it. These steps must be taken towards a nuclear-free world. The situation is wuch that any half measures or partial solutions do not remove the main danger. They do not remove the danger of a nuclear war. This is elementary logic: As long as there are nuclear weapons there is the danger of a nuclear war. This is the starting point of our thinking, the starting point of our policy. It is possible to debate the probability of a nuclear war, but this is another question. What we wish is to make it completely improbable.

So the first thing I wish to stress is the need to examine every specific step in the disarmament problem as a step toward that goal we have set for ourselves. In this matter I sometimes feel our western colleagues, our western partners somehow -- how could I say it -- underestimate the importance of understanding this final goal. They somewhat underestimate the need to set themselves the direct task -- to strive for a nuclear free world.

There is a second lesson the last year has also taught us, and which was very clearly emphasized: It is very difficult to talk of concrete and productive steps aimed at destroying a certain part of the weapons on earth when, at the same time, very specific, very definite steps are being taken to take the nuclear arms race into space.

From our point of view, when I attempt to understand the logic of our Western partners, I find it at times not entirely clear. We say: Weapons exist on earth, let us reduce them. At the same time let us not take weapons into space. No, say our Western partners, let us reduce those on earth but at the same time let us think about adding some more to space. This too we perceive to be not very logical. I am afraid that if we should start formulating a positive program, forgetting about the fact that we are all faced with this problem of space militarization, or Strategic Defense Initiative, or Star Wars -- call it what you wish -- then perhaps we would not be entirely realistic in evaluating the situation if we ignore this circumstance.

So, as they say, it is always necessary to establish certain parameters in posing each task. I see them to be, on the one hand, the problem of Star Wars and the problem of preventing a parallel arms race in space, and on the other hand, the goal -- the notion that to liquidate the danger of a nuclear war, we must achieve a nuclear free world.

[Zorin] The topic of our discussion leads us to the problem of new thinking -- thinking in a nuclear age. It seems a totally new situation in which contemporary mankind has found itself makes practically unacceptable that which people have gotten used to over centuries -- the method of thinking that existed among politicians and others for centuries. I wish to ask you, Mr Minister, how you conceptualize the development of a nuclear world in which it is essential to avoid a war, how and in what form in current conditions should thinking in the nuclear age be personified?

[Renton] Forgive me for not answering immediately, I wanted to listen to the end of the translation. First, I wish to say that I do not think that the new form of thinking about which you have spoken -- and since I have been here I have clearly seen the extent to which the turn to a new way of thinking has been taking place in the USSR -- is applicable only to the nuclear problem. It is relevant to other questions as well, such as the spread of culture between our two countries; a better acquaintance with each other; greater opportunities to visit each other; human rights, the question relating to the opportunities for individuals of a country, including your own, to depart the country more easily, if they so desire, to visit friends or relatives, or simply for a holiday in another country.

All this taken together also appears to me to be a part of the new thinking. This is being discussed quite correctly at the conference devoted to the Helsinki Final Act, which is now taking place in Vienna.

Now I will move on to the nuclear problem. There are matters in which I cannot agree with Mr Bovin, who twice returned to the idea that it is necessary to achieve a nuclear-free world. Personally, I do not believe that it is possible to shelve the discovery of the wheel. And I do not believe that after the invention of the machine gun, which was widely used against both our countries World War I and World War II, that it is possible to discard them or order our forces to return to the use of old rifles.

When Mr Bovin speaks of the necessity to achieve a nuclear-free world, I remind myself that such statements somewhat resemble utopian dream.

In any case, that is how I see them. We are all obviously entitled to our dream. It is characteristic for all of us to dream. But in the final analysis we are forced to live under conditions of practical reality. Presently, nuclear weapons are part of the deterrent forces which ensure stability for both our countries and for both of the alliances to which our countries belong. The NATO alliance, of which my country is a member, unequivocally promises never to be the first to make use of weapons. We will use them only in retaliation to an attack. [Tverdo obeshchayet nikogda pervym ne primenyat oruzhiya. My primenim ego tolko v ovet na napadeniye] The fact also remains that NATO strategy, which is based both on conventional and nuclear arms, has been one of the factors of the strategy of deterrence that has helped preserve peace in Western Europe, where I live, all these years since the end of the tragic World War II in 1945 -- a war in which both our countries participated and in which we fought shoulder to shoulder. Therefore I do not agree that the goal of achieving a new, nuclear-free world is a realistic and practical task for the near future. I would rather concentrate my attention on a gradual, step-by-step, very substantial reduction in arms, as well as on talks for the reduction of conventional arms. In this way we could show our children something positive at the end of this or the next year, rather than speaking about concepts, which, I repeat, contain utopian elements of hope. We have a saying in Britain, and I am certain that you have a similar one in the Soviet Union; Don't try to run until you have learned to walk. We are also very pragmatic people, and the essence of my talk boils down to precisely this, to the practical aim of achieving a substantial reduction. I feel that this is possible for us, including the complete destruction of chemical weapons. I think that it is better to concentrate on this than on striving, at this moment, for the ideal of a nuclear-free world.

[Zorin] I think that my colleagues will respond to you. Before they do, I wish, Mr Minister, to express the opinion that your comparison of machine guns with atomic weapons has not convinced me. And the new thinking ....

[Renton interrupts] I do not attempt to draw an exact parallel between these. I merely tried to make a historical analogy that inventions, the wheel, for example, cannot be ignored. Obviously, as we all know, nuclear weapons contain frightening power. Various statesmen in the world have said on many occasions that there should never be a nuclear war. I agree with this...

[Bovin interrupts] But you are proposing to reject chemical weapons. Therefore it is possible to reject the wheel.

[Zorin] I wish to complete the thought...

[Renton] I will come back to that.

[Zorin] New thinking occurs because mankind finds itself in a new situation. Not one of all the thousands of generations that existed before us was faced with the situation where mankind can destroy itself. Now such a situation exists. To affirm that an attempt to prevent this self-destruction of mankind is utopian is, in my opinion, pessimism, and I might add, dangerous pessimism. Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, you wanted to say something.

[Bovin] Yes, in regards to utopia. It is very interesting to polemicize with an Englishman about utopia. Because, as I understand it, the concept of utopia first came about in England, and the first who used this concept -- admittedly this was a long time ago, -- was, I think, Thomas More.

[Rention interrupts] Thomas More was one of my heroes, if I can put it that way, when I was studying at the university.

[Bovin] Yes. regretfully, he was unfortunate: I think he was executed, although not over the idea of utopia. Now, as far as utopia is concerned, the experience of history teaches us that one cannot put it in such an abstract way -- this can be done and this cannot, this is possible and that is impossible. It is precisely history that shows that sometimes the impossible becomes possible -- in fact history to a certain degree is the realization of utopia.

Now I will try to refer to an authority on the matter who is also well-known to the British. Recently I was working a little on the topic of utopia, and I came across an idea expressed by Oscar Wilde. Oscar Wilde put it this way: It is not worth looking at a map of the world that does not show utopia, insofar as such a map ignores a country that mankind tirelessly strives to reach. Progress is the realization of utopia.

[Renton] Permit me to say that insofar as possibly not all of you listeners know who Oscar Wilde was, he was neither a politician nor cartographer -- he did not compile maps. He was a poet, a dreamer, and a romantic, and he was a playwright. It is precisely people such as this who often believe that utopia can be realized.

[Bovin] I assure you our readers know Oscar Wilde very well, because his works are often translated here...

[Renton interrupts] I am delighted to hear this -- this is wonderful.

[Bovin] Yes. Now, that is the first point that I would like to draw attention to: The fact that in history, that which appears impossible becomes possible -- it can become possible. The second point is that it is more pragmatic to say nuclear deterrence exists. For 40 years it has guaranteed peace, so what more do we need? After all, things are good and this deterrence is working perfectly well.

But what is deterrence after all? If you will, it is the conservation of the potential for self-destruction. This is what deterrence really is. Yes, today you have managed to deter, but what if you cannot? This is where the problem lies. According to our logic, we say deterrence is a reality we cannot avoid. This is not an ideal situation -- it is not a policy that can be an aim. While deterrence exists it is precisely... [changes thought] It gives us time -- it gives us breathing space to try and find an alternative to deterrence, an alternative that would not harbor the possibility of mankind's self-destruction. Because I would like to reiterate this again: Despite the fact that deterrence really exists and we do deter one another, nevertheless one cannot deny that in this deterrence there is nothing to restrain events. What if things do not work? Then we will all perish. Hence, our logic lies in getting away from this at all costs. We should move to another system of reference, where we would not be threatened by this Sword of Damocles, this self-destruction. I would like to repeat again that the only system of reference accomplishing this task is a nuclear-free world.

Of course, we do not maintain that this may be tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. The Gorbachev plan we have been talking about envisages precisely certain definite steps, certain stages of development in this direction. Nevertheless, if you do not have this aim as a realistic aim -- if you consider this aim to be utopian -- I am afraid that you will never get away from the world in which you must deter one another with the threat of self-destruction, because ultimately this is the result of deterrence.

Now, we have already spoken about a new political thinking. It seems to me that it is precisely when I hear these arguments in favor of deterrence that it seems to me this is a manifestation of the old pre-nuclear thinking in the new nuclear age, when old categories are already useless -- they do not work. It is very difficult to admit to oneself that we do not have a guaranteed future -- that we may be the last generation or our children may be the last generation. It is very difficult to come to grips with this, and one constantly wants to alienate oneself from this prospect, to say that it was someone's and this may not be so at all.

It seems to me that in these circumstances it is better to rely on the worst version, and to seek solutions that would deliver us from the worst version. I would like to reiterate again there is no alternative to a nuclear-free world in this sense. All other decisions will be half-measures. They may somehow alleviate the probability of war, but the possibility of war will remain. This is what we are talking about in the framework of the new political thinking.

[Zorin] By the way, I would like to remind you, Mr Renton, that when a year ago this program was outlined in Comrade Gorbachev's statement, many, including people in your country, declared it utopian. Several months have passed and what was declared utopian became reality on the Reykjavik agenda. You have to agree that at the conversation in Camp David you refer to...

[Renton interrupts in English without Russian translation superimposed] On the agenda of what? I (?did not catch it).

[Zorin] The proposals contained in Gorbachev's statement were discussed as a real political issue and as realities during the meeting between the President and general secretary in Reykjavik. Consequently, what was said to be utopian has all of a sudden -- or rather by natural law -- become a political reality. Irrespective of what happened later or what Western leaders said after Reykjavik, Reykjavik is a contemporary fact from which you cannot escape.

[Zhurkin] I would like to return to a remark by Mr Renton and to an objection which cannot be simply laughed off. It concerns his remark about it being impossible to un-invent the wheel.

I think this is a serious consideration which requires much thought. Today we do not have a program, some kind of developed proposal on how measures will be taken in a nuclear-free world to prevent the resurgence of nuclear arms. That is a great challenge for the human mind, I think. I think this will have to be considered. Maybe accumulated experience will be used. Some experience has been gained in banning chemical weapons. Or there is the experience of the IAEA which exercises serious control over the peaceful uses of nuclear energy in countries of the world.

Well, that is a big challenge, a big problem we shall have to solve at some point. Personally I think this problem can be solved. Of course, it will require a change in the political situation in the world. Most probably it will require greater prevalence of the new thinking in the contemporary world. All the nations, all the states must take part in the development of new thinking, because new thinking is not somebody's monopoly, but a big practical issue which will have to be solved. I am convinced that this issue can be solved.

[Renton] You promised me a minute before turning to another question. I would like to answer very quickly what Mr Bovin has said.

[Rention interrupts] Thomas More was one of my heroes, if I can put it that way, when I was studying at the university.

[Bovin] Yes. regretfully, he was unfortunate: I think he was executed, although not over the idea of utopia. Now, as far as utopia is concerned, the experience of history teaches us that one cannot put it in such an abstract way -- this can be done and this cannot, this is possible and that is impossible. It is precisely history that shows that sometimes the impossible becomes possible -- in fact history to a certain degree is the realization of utopia.

Now I will try to refer to an authority on the matter who is also well-known to the British. Recently I was working a little on the topic of utopia, and I came across an idea expressed by Oscar Wilde. Oscar Wilde put it this way: It is not worth looking at a map of the world that does not show utopia, insofar as such a map ignores a country that mankind tirelessly strives to reach. Progress is the realization of utopia.

[Renton] Permit me to say that insofar as possibly not all of you listeners know who Oscar Wilde was, he was neither a politician nor cartographer -- he did not compile maps. He was a poet, a dreamer, and a romantic, and he was a playwright. It is precisely people such as this who often believe that utopia can be realized.

[Bovin] I assure you our readers know Oscar Wilde very well, because his works are often translated here...

[Renton interrupts] I am delighted to hear this -- this is wonderful.

[Bovin] Yes. Now, that is the first point that I would like to draw attention to: The fact that in history, that which appears impossible becomes possible -- it can become possible. The second point is that it is more pragmatic to say nuclear deterrence exists. For 40 years it has guaranteed peace, so what more do we need? After all, things are good and this deterrence is working perfectly well.

But what is deterrence after all? If you will, it is the conservation of the potential for self-destruction. This is what deterrence really is. Yes, today you have managed to deter, but what if you cannot? This is where the problem lies. According to our logic, we say deterrence is a reality we cannot avoid. This is not an ideal situation -- it is not a policy that can be an aim. While deterrence exists it is precisely... [changes thought] It gives us time -- it gives us breathing space to try and find an alternative to deterrence, an alternative that would not harbor the possibility of mankind's self-destruction. Because I would like to reiterate this again: Despite the fact that deterrence really exists and we do deter one another, nevertheless one cannot deny that in this deterrence there is nothing to restrain events. What if things do not work? Then we will all perish. Hence, our logic lies in getting away from this at all costs. We should move to another system of reference, where we would not be threatened by this Sword of Damocles, this self-destruction. I would like to repeat again that the only system of reference accomplishing this task is a nuclear-free world.

Of course, we do not maintain that this may be tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. The Gorbachev plan we have been talking about envisages precisely certain definite steps, certain stages of development in this direction. Nevertheless, if you do not have this aim as a realistic aim -- if you consider this aim to be utopian -- I am afraid that you will never get away from the world in which you must deter one another with the threat of self-destruction, because ultimately this is the result of deterrence.

Now, we have already spoken about a new political thinking. It seems to me that it is precisely when I hear these arguments in favor of deterrence that it seems to me this is a manifestation of the old pre-nuclear thinking in the new nuclear age, when old categories are already useless -- they do not work. It is very difficult to admit to oneself that we do not have a guaranteed future -- that we may be the last generation or our children may be the last generation. It is very difficult to come to grips with this, and one constantly wants to alienate oneself from this prospect, to say that it was someone's and this may not be so at all.

It seems to me that in these circumstances it is better to rely on the worst version, and to seek solutions that would deliver us from the worst version. I would like to reiterate again there is no alternative to a nuclear-free world in this sense. All other decisions will be half-measures. They may somehow alleviate the probability of war, but the possibility of war will remain. This is what we are talking about in the framework of the new political thinking.

[Zorin] By the way, I would like to remind you, Mr Renton, that when a year ago this program was outlined in Comrade Gorbachev's statement, many, including people in your country, declared it utopian. Several months have passed and what was declared utopian became reality on the Reykjavik agenda. You have to agree that at the conversation in Camp David you refer to...

[Renton interrupts in English without Russian translation superimposed] On the agenda of what? I (?did not catch it).

[Zorin] The proposals contained in Gorbachev's statement were discussed as a real political issue and as realities during the meeting between the President and general secretary in Reykjavik. Consequently, what was said to be utopian has all of a sudden -- or rather by natural law -- become a political reality. Irrespective of what happened later or what Western leaders said after Reykjavik, Reykjavik is a contemporary fact from which you cannot escape.

[Zhurkin] I would like to return to a remark by Mr Renton and to an objection which cannot be simply laughed off. It concerns his remark about it being impossible to un-invent the wheel.

I think this is a serious consideration which requires much thought. Today we do not have a program, some kind of developed proposal on how measures will be taken in a nuclear-free world to prevent the resurgence of nuclear arms. That is a great challenge for the human mind, I think. I think this will have to be considered. Maybe accumulated experience will be used. Some experience has been gained in banning chemical weapons. Or there is the experience of the IAEA which exercises serious control over the peaceful uses of nuclear energy in countries of the world.

Well, that is a big challenge, a big problem we shall have to solve at some point. Personally I think this problem can be solved. Of course, it will require a change in the political situation in the world. Most probably it will require greater prevalence of the new thinking in the contemporary world. All the nations, all the states must take part in the development of new thinking, because new thinking is not somebody's monopoly, but a big practical issue which will have to be solved. I am convinced that this issue can be solved.

[Renton] You promised me a minute before turning to another question. I would like to answer very quickly what Mr Bovin has said.

Naturally we all have a utopian dream and we all hope it will be realized sometime. I am second to none in my aversion for nuclear weapons, and I no less than anyone else am aware of the terrible destructive power of these weapons. My utopia is total and universal disarmament and we all support it, through the United Nations for example.

To achieve it we have to cover a long road in reducing the size of conventional arms and armed forces and eliminating the imbalance, existing at present between them. We in NATO must consider that Warsaw Pact countries have at their disposal considerably larger conventional non-nuclear forces than us. We are ready to begin discussing this problem with the participation of our country and other NATO countries, your country and other Warsaw Pact countries. In our point of view, many years will be required to achieve the realization of this utopia of total and universal disarmament, however hard our political leaders and diplomats work at it. This is why I offer immediate and practical alternative steps which represent these concrete measures for reducing strategic arms by 50 percent, for example, or a complete ban on chemical weapons. These are measures we can implement in the nearest future in the course of a practical step-by-step approach, which I think would bring great benefits to the people of our two countries.

[Zhurkin] I think 40 years of the nuclear age is a sufficiently long period at which to look back, to rejoice that we are still alive after these 40 years, and nevertheless to look at what was not achieved over these 40 years. It was not only nuclear deterrence which played a definite role, not only the policy of these or other states, but sometimes it was just chance or luck that saved mankind.

I think there is now sufficient ground to think about building a peace which will not be dependent on chance or luck. That will have to be a peace with clearly defined ultimate goals. This program aimed tthe ultimate goal must include concrete practical steps for limiting and reducing arms; t he more radical and greater these concrete steps are, the better. This is our approach; this is the approach of the Soviet Union, the approach of the Soviet people to this issue.

[Zorin] I do not think there is any point in comparing ultimate goals with concrete measures. They are interconnected, and the concrete measures acquire a meaning only if those who implement them visualize the ultimate goal.

Rejecting the idea of an ultimate goal, declaring it utopian, and concentrating everything on concrete steps means cheapening the program of concrete steps. The fact that we are viewing this as indivisible, Mr Renton, is borne out by an analysis of all the documents of the past year including the same 15 January 1986 statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich and subsequent statements. These statements, in addition to the goal of creating a nuclear-free world by the year 2000, include a large number of realistic proposals which can be viewed as concrete steps. There are not only proposals. I cannot fail to mention the Soviet Union has not conducted nuclear tests for a year and a half, observing a moratorium which has been extended five times. These are precisely concrete measures aimed at attaining the ultimate goal, which we do not consider to be utopian.

[Renton] I cannot say that I agree with you or your colleagues concerning the great significance you attach to the declaration on final goals. Speaking frankly as a practical Briton, I think that declaring such final goals has more to do with political speeches and declarations. It lacks a substantially important element, that of practicality.

As to the problems of any arms control agreement, the devil is hidden in the details, as they say in Britain. It is too easy to say that we want to eliminate all these categories of arms. What has to be done in actuality -- and this is where the experts start their work -- is to sit at the table with the understanding that we are striving to achieve the same goal, and discuss the details. As to chemical weapons, we have laid on the table our proposal concerning verification on request [proverka pozaprosu], which represents a key element in verification. I am very happy that this proposal is being studied by the Soviet side.

But it is quite evident that to verify if anyone possesses chemical weapons -- and I have to say that according to our estimates the Soviet Union has approximately 300,000 tons of chemical weapons while we destroyed ours 20 years ago already -- to establish that all stocks have actually been destroyed, and that their production has not been resumed it will require extraordinarily detailed talks, discussions, and agreements on the system of control, and verification that the other side is not cheating.

The same applies to the nuclear test ban treaty. All the sides wish to move toward a provision under which the nuclear explosions will be very small and limited to peaceful purposes. That will require very careful control. I regret that our proposal presented at the disarmament conference in Geneva that provided for meetings of experts to study all the difficulties which we still see in the issue of control of the nuclear test ban, was not supported by the Soviet side. You preferred to limit yourselves to declarative gestures.

I would like to think with respect to chemical weapons and settlement of difficulties connected with control of the ban on their production and stockpiling, as well as with respect to verifying the cessation of nuclear test explosions -- with the exception of very limited explosions for peaceful purposes -- I think that in order to solve all these problems we must sit all together at the negotiating table, at forums like the disarmament conference in Geneva.

[Zhurkin] I would like to say a few words first about chemical weapons. I could agree with Mr Renton when he compared Britain with the Soviet Union in this regard. I reject the figures because you can argue forever about figures. I would agree with him if we lived in the world of Christopher Columbus before he discovered America. But behind Britain, beyond the Atlantic Ocean, lies a country which not only has very powerful chemical weapons, but is now entering the stage of actively producing binary weapons. For this reason it would be more correct to characterize the situation this way.

Let us approach chemical weapons from another perspective. We have no problems concerning chemical weapons. Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, to which we referred, says plainly that we are in favor of the complete destruction of chemical weapons. The Soviet Union presented in Geneva a detailed and extensive proposal precisely concerning verification and inspection, and not only destruction of chemical weapons but also how to conduct verification in laboratories, at enterprises producing chemical weapons, and how they would be controlled.

[Zorin] I would like to continue our talk by posing the following question: In the presence of differing points of view on many questions, I feel we can all perhaps agree the present situation existing in the world is unsatisfactory to all of us. The dangers inherent in the existing situation are obvious. Therefore, I would like to ask all of you the same question. Do you consider a turn from the existing state of affairs to be realistic? Obviously, I mean a turn for the better. Let us start with you, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich.

[Bovin] Well. If we are speaking about possibilities in the near future, say in 1987, then I would probably be a pessimist. As long as the present administration is in the White House, I cannot imagine the possibilities for large, strategically meaningful agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States. This is one of those rare occasions when I would like to be wrong. I would very much like to be wrong. But, unfortunately, events, at least in the past 6 years, have not permitted me to view the situation more optimistically. I think that certainly we will continue to have talks with the Americans. We will continue to discuss all these problems. We will continue to preserve maximum patience and maximum will to achieve some results. All this goes without saying. But, I wish to repeat once again, speaking quite plainly, I do not believe the present U.S. President and I do not believe it would be possible to reach significant agreement with him. Even more so since we have seen clearly that Reagan's presidency has slowly gone into decline.

Some pose the following logic: Perhaps precisely because of this Reagan will attempt to compensate for his various difficulties in certain areas by actively meeting with the Soviet Union in an effort to reach some meaningful agreements. If this were the case, then it would be wonderful. One could only welcome such an eventuality. But I repeat, this does not seem to be likely. Therefore, I will repeat it again, I do not think that 1987 will bring about significant political change, either for better or worse. It will remain approximately the same as 1986.

Furthermore, the question is even more complex because it is not merely a question of foreign policy. In the final analysis, foreign policy is a reflection of deeper social processes. I feel the wave of neoconservatism which is to be seen in the Western world since the end of the seventies -- not only in America -- this wave of neoconservatism is perhaps making Western foreign policy harder, less flexible. This obviously is also being reflected in some specific things with which we must deal.

Therefore, I feel on the one hand we must continue with active attempts to reach some form of agreement, while on the other hand we must already think in terms of the post-Reagan period.

[Zorin] I am forced to disagree with my colleague. I see the situation differently, [Renton says: So do I] because the matter here is not in subjective factors but in objective ones. If someone would have attempt to forecast, a few months prior to Reykjavik, what President Reagan's position would be there, then such a seer would simply have been laughed at. But Reykjavik did take place, and even the fact that later people in the White House started to backtrack on it does not change that which had taken place. There are personal wishes, there are specific circumstances that have formed in Washington, but there are also objective factors, objective factors which influence the President. There is a certain new distribution of forces in Washington. There is a new situation in Congress. Therefore, I cannot join the ranks of those who see 1987 in a pessimistic way.

I feel that chances for progress do exist. If Aleksandr Yevgenyevich ended his evaluation with the conclusion that 1987 will not be any better than the preceding year, then it will be wonderful, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, if it does not turn out to be worse. That will be wonderful, Mr Renton.

[Renton] I agree with much of your optimism, Mr Zorin. It is important not to look at the temperature chart, not to measure the patient's temperature every day, but rather to look at definite progress. And if, as you have said, we will make similar progress after a long period of stagnation, and progress in the area of arms control in 1987, as we began to do in 1986, then such steps can be considered very positive. I do not feel the need to defend President Reagan or the U.S. economy.

I look at that country and see an enormous return of confidence that President Reagan has given to the Americans during the years of his presidency. I pay particular attention to my own country and other West European countries. I see that in recent years we have gone a long way in controlling inflation, and in raising the standard of living of our people.

I am not a neoconservative, Mr Zorin. I consider myself a radical conservative. I deeply believe in the market economy, in allowing the consumer the right to chose which goods he wishes to purchase and what price should be paid for these goods. In recent years very positive steps in this direction were taken in Great Britain. As a result of this, our economy has become much stronger. This is not egotism. Many of our young people are travelling to help others in poorer and developing countries. The EEC is making large contributions to the countries. The EEC is making large contributions to the countries of Africa south of the Sahara, where there was a frightening drought and hunger. All these are positive steps and I hope that in 1987 all this will be continued.

I have to end by saying that I am a party politician. As a radical conservative, I will be placed in the situation, perhaps even this year, of facing a reelection. And if I should be reelected to the House of Commons, then 1987 will turn out to be a good year for me. I very much hope that the Conservative Government, of which I am a member, will also be reelected for a third term. This is quite an important goal for a democratic party politician.

[Zhurkin] First of all, I have to say something is going on that is not quite right. Logically, as three Soviets we should all throw ourselves against Mr. Renton. But what is in fact happening is that an Englishman and two Soviets are attacking my friend, Aleksandr Bovin. I too would have liked to attack him. (laughter) You know, Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, I feel that generally a pessimist lives well because should something good happen in the future everyone is happy and all have forgotten who predicted what. But if something bad happens, then everyone says that the pessimist was right.

It is harder for the optimist because he is forgotten when things work out well, and when things happen to go wrong everyone points their finger at him and says "see, his prediction was wrong."

Therefore, taking a more serious tone, I feel that certainly it is difficult now to predict how events will realistically develop. A struggle between two tendencies is taking place. One is a positive tendency, the other a negative one. Which one of these will prevail is difficult to say. Personally I feel that despite all, the positive tendency is gaining strength. Let me give you a small example. Mr Renton spoke about the verification of, say, nuclear tests. Whoever in England would have thought 2 or 3 years ago the Soviet Union would bring foreign correspondents to its nuclear test range, or invite the Americans to check....

[Zorin interrupts] With their own equipment.

[Zhurik] With their own equipment. I think this would have been considered unbelievable. This is a big change. Nevertheless, I feel it is better to believe in these positive changes. By the way, it is a pity that trilateral talks are not beginning about the ending of nuclear tests. These talks were pointlessly broken off by the West. Should they be resumed, certainly the question of verification must play a very significant role. This is the Soviet position.

Therefore I am on the side of the optimists, even though I realize the difficulty of the situation, and the great force counteracting this factor.

[Renton] Of course difficulties exist, but one of the positive aspects is the fact that the four of us are sitting at a roundtable and discussing all this. I would like to think that the Soviet side could have accepted the official U.S. proposal to send its observers to the Nevada test range, so as to note and implement control over U.S. nuclear tests. I feel this would have been a very positive step.

[Zhurkin] I am restoring to my right to interrupt. This proposal is surrounded with such difficulties and such conditions that it makes it difficult for our physicists to accept.

[Renton interrupts] This is not my understanding of the question. I find it difficult now to understand why the Soviet Union is prepared to accept U.S. scientists and an official delegation at its test range, but refuses to accept an invitation and officially visit the U.S. test range. Should there be some conditions related to this invitation, then I feel that this question should be looked into and resolved. As I understand it, there has been no reply to the invitation. I wish to end on a positive note. The fact that the four of us are discussing these questions is symbolic of the long ties between our countries -- historical, trade, and culture ties, and our joint struggle in the last terrible war. We fought in the last war on the same side. We have a common interest in [words indistinct] the massive reduction of nuclear arms. And if I do not see a totally nuclear-free world, about which General Secretary Gorbachev spoke, it is because I believe, nevertheless, in all the practical steps -- the gradual, step-by-step approach -- which I have outlined. I hope that it is more probable that this could be reached in a reasonable time. Therefore, I feel this to be a positive goal and it should be aspired to. If we should get close to an agreement or to a draft agreement in 1987, then this year will be an extraordinarily good year in the cause of peace in which our countries and our peoples are interested.

[Zorin in English] Thank you Mr Minister. [continues in Russian] Our time is running out. Before ending our program I wish to add a reference. We have determined our position on the reason why we do not wish to be officially present at tests in the United States. We are for a ban on the tests, but our presence at the tests could be construed as agreement to the continuation of these tests. This position has been determined by us.

[Renton interrupts] But this would help with the problem of verification. This really is the case, in terms of control. This would have helped with the joint solution of verification.

[Zorin] It is not the tests that should be verified but the fact that they are not taking place. This is the position of the Soviet Union. We are for banning these tests. However, for all to feel secure these tests are not taking place, there should be complete control, including onsite control. In the course of our discussion today differing views were expressed. It became clear that we and the representative of the West diverge over a number of questions, and this should not surprise anyone. It is normal. I feel what is far more significant and consistent with the spirit of the times is the fact that in the course of our discussion we have touched on points of convergence and mutual points of view. This is very important. If you wish, this too is a result of the events of the past year, a year that in my opinion will be remembered by history above all as the year in which the call for the creation of a nuclear-free world has been transformed from a dream into a political reality and has turned into a concrete agenda placed on the table of most important talks. It remains for me to thank the participants in our discussion today, and to express the hope that this will not be the last opportunity for such a discussion, especially since the discussion has been fruitful; and to thank our viewers for their attention. Until we meet again here in Studio 9, Thank you.

[Renton] Thank you very much. Most interesting. Thank you. [in English]

TASS REPORTS REAGAN 'STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS'

LD281133 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 28 Jan 87

['Reagan: Address on the State of the Union" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Washington January 28 TASS -- President Ronald Reagan delivered the traditional annual State of the Union Address to both houses of Congress.

Ronald Reagan said that "We have done much these past years to restore our defences, our alliances, and our leadership in the world." The President called for "more constructive relations" with the Soviet Union, but hedged his statement with a number of conditions, such as "more responsible Soviet conduct around the world" and "progress on the other items of our agenda as well -- real respect for human rights." He also maliciously attacked the Soviet Union's foreign and domestic policies and the socialist system.

Claiming a desire to seek cuts in nuclear weapons, the President simultaneously lauded the "Star Wars" programme. He misrepresented the character of the Soviet-American summit talks in Reykjavik, saying that the Soviet side only "sought to cripple our Strategic Defense Initiative." "SDI will go forward," he said.

Reagan warned Congress, which has before it draft resolutions demanding the repudiation of the administration's decision not to comply with the SALT-2 treaty and an end to or drastic restrictions on the yield of nuclear tests and in which demands are made for cuts in inflated military spending, including on the "Star Wars" programme, that he would not tolerate such steps. "I must tell this Congress I will veto any efforts that undercut our national security and our negotiating leverage," he said.

In the spirit of the doctrine of neo-globalism the President spoke of the U.S. policy with regard to Nicaragua, stating an intention to continue to give every kind of support to the contras through whom the Central Intelligence Agency conducts the undeclared war against that sovereign country.

As a "justification" for the aggressive course, Reagan referred to the Monroe Doctrine under which the United States had at one time assumed a certain "right" to dictate and establish its ways in Latin America.

It was in a rather cautious tone that Reagan touched upon "Irangate", the scandal which had broken out as a result of the exposure of U.S. secret arms shipments to Iran and the diversion of part of the sales profits to the anti-Nicaraguan contras at a time when military support for the Somocistas had been banned by the Congress. The U.S. President admitted that "serious mistakes" had been made in the pursuance of the policy with regard to Iran.

At the same time he proclaimed the administration's intention to continue to give greater scope to U.S. interference in the Middle East.

"We will not sit idly by if our interests or our friends in the Middle East are threatened," he said.

When speaking of the U.S. internal political situation, the President admitted that many problems of the United States remained unresolved.

These are, first of all, the huge deficit of the federal budget, which the President referred to as colossal, mass unemployment, the rate of which he described as "still too high", and the high cost of medical service, which, he said, arouses in people "the fear of an illness so expensive that it can result in having to make an intolerable choice between bankruptcy and death", the lack of access to education, which leads to widespread illiteracy among young people, and drug addiction.

At the same time, the President stated that he would seek from Congress full satisfaction of the administration's reuest for military expenditures for the 1988 fiscal year and further slashing and cuts in social programmes which he described as "outmoded social dinosaur".

The UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL has remarked that the State of the Union message has been viewed as a rhetoric exercise.

The CBS TV network has pointed out that the message enabled the President to display his talent as an orator, and that from the viewpoint of content there was nothing new in the message itself.

The ABC TV network noted, for its part, that there were no new ideas in the message.

'Crude Anti-Soviet Thrusts' Cited

LD280609 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0534 GMT 28 Jan 87

[Text] Washington 28 Jan -- Nikolay Turkatenko, a TASS correspondent reports:

President Reagan delivered the traditional annual "State of the Union" address on Tuesday in the U.S. Congress. He demanded that Congress completely satisfy the administration's request for military expenditures in the 1988 fiscal year of $312 billion. "Our efforts to strengthen the military might of America make the world safer," asserted the President.

Reagan spoke out for "more constructive relations" with the Soviet Union. However, he linked the United State's readiness to develop relations with the USSR to the "behavior" of the Soviet Union on the international scene. Furthermore, his positive appeals for an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations were essentially swamped in the torrent of crude anti-Soviet thrusts. Touching on the situation in various regions of the world, Reagan left the U.S. Administration the "right" to continue to expand U.S. intervention in the Near East and in Central America under the pretext of defending the national interests of the United States, its "friends" and allies.

Stating the necessity of achieving a reduction in nuclear weapons, the President at the same time confirmed the administration's adherence to the "Star Wars" program, which as is known, is the main obstacle in the way of achieving an accord on a reduction in strategic nuclear weapons. He again presented a distorted picture of the essence of the summit talks in Reykjavik. The President frankly made it clear to Congress, where resolutions demanding the observance by the administration of the SALT II treaty, the cessation or sharp limitation of the power of nuclear tests, and the unswerving observance of the ABM Treaty have been introduced, that he is categorically against such steps. Reagan promised to veto any measures taken by Congress in this field that do not coincide with the approach of the administration.

MOSCOW WORLD SERVICE ON UPCOMING CPSU PLENUM

LD262240 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 26 Jan 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] As you have head in the news, the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee is to look into the issue of restructuring and personnel policy at its full-scale meeting opening on Tuesday. The meeting will focus on the policy worked out and endorsed by the party at the 27th congress last spring on its implementation and on its concrete (?problems). At this point, it is necessary to reemphasize the party's role in our life. As the vanguard of Soviet society it sets development guidelines, formulates the tasks in the social, economic and intellectual fields and selects the senior personnel accordingly. It's the party that has initiated the renewal that is gaining momentum in this country. The idea of renewal and restructuring was getting ripe among the people. The ruling party sensed the people's moods and took the ever-changing, objective factors of internal and international development into account. Honestly and straightly, the party pointed to the shortcomings of the seventies and early eighties, including the unfavorable trend towards slower economic development, and proposed speeding up scientific and technological progress. The party's course was enthusiastically approved by the people. The policy (?is being) put into effect and its results are borne out by the statistics on last year's performance published recently. While in the early eighties the growth of industrial output was hardly over 3 percent, last year it topped 4.9 percent. In agriculture, grain output was nearly 30 million tons higher than the average annual harvest for the 5 previous years. The population's real incomes went up by 2.3 percent. People in the Soviet Union live better today than a year ago, but it is not only the material quality of life that matters. People are living in a somewhat different climate. The social atmosphere is changing. Democracy is being advanced and openness is being expanded. The people are taking over the business of restructuring and renewal. There have been more and more innovators in production and more and more firm opponents to obsolete thinking, deeply rooted stereotypes, inertia and complacency. There is a real battle underway against everything that stands in the way of restructuring.

This fight is being waged above all through the mass media. As in the economy, where enterprises are still applying methods that have proved inefficient, some people-managers included, are conservative-minded and opposed to change. Such opponents can be found among party members too. For this reason the party declared from its very beginning that it would start restructuring within itself. Its principle in this respect was approved at the 27th congress in the Central Committee's political report to the congress which said -- and I quote -- in the party there is no, and must not be, any organization out of control, closed to criticism, nor must there be leaders who cannot be held responsible by the party -- unquote. There is every reason to say that today the Communist Party and the Soviet people are on the whole more convinced than ever before that the course being pursued is correct and that restructuring is indispensable. Moreover, the people are getting increasingly aware that the line of restructuring and renewal should be pursued steadfastly and firmly and with more persistence than before. This, incidentally, shows the responsibility of the Soviet Communists not only to their people but also to the socialist world as a whole, because what have all these changes been advanced for? Mikhail Gorbachev said this at the meeting in the party's Central Committee on 23 January. In the long run, everything we want to do is to greatly strengthen our state, economically, politically and socially, and to make the people better off. The party has come to the full-scale meeting of its Central Committee with exactly such (?assets).

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLENUM BEGINS WORK 27 JAN

LD271636 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Jan 87

[Text] An information report on the CPSU Central Committee plenum:

A routine [ocherednoy] plenary session of the CPSU Central Committee began its work on 27 January. The question of restructuring the party's cadre policy has been put forward for the plenum's examination.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report on this question.

The plenum's participants were given an opportunity to familiarize themselves beforehand with the thesis in the report by Comrade Gorbachev and also with a draft law of the USSR on the state enterprise and the association and with a review of working peoples' letters on questions relating to restructuring and cadre policy.

Taking part in the debates on the report during today's session were: Comrade Polozkov, first secretary of the Krasnodar Kraykom; Slyunkov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Vorotnikov, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; Golubeva, director of the Ivanovo Kirov Textile Works; Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Shcherbitskiy, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; Yeltsin, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom; Arbatov, director of the U.S. and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Solovyev, first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom; Petrov, first secretary of the Sverdlovsk Obkom; Tereshchenko, chairman of the Put k Kommunizmu Kolkhoz of the Stepanovskiy Rayon of Stavropol Kray.

Tomorrow the CPSU Central Committee plenum will continue its work.

'Text' of Gorbachev Report

LD271006 Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 27 Jan 87

[Text] Moscow January 27 TASS -- Follows the full text of the report "On Reorganization and the Party's Personnel Policy" delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee on January 27, 1987. [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 28 January 1987 in its Second Edition publishes the text of the Gorbachev report but omits this TASS English introductory paragraph. Further variations from this PRAVDA version are noted in brackets within the text below]

Comrades,

The 27th party congress vested in us, members of the Central Committee, the immense responsibility of ensuring the strategic course of accelerating the socio-economic development of the country. The Politburo understands the situation and the role of the Central Committee at the current stage in the life of Soviet society precisely in this way.

It is proceeding from this that the plenary meeting has on its agenda a matter of paramount importance for the effective implementation of the political strategy drafted by the April 1985 plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the 27th CPSU Congress, the question of reorganization and the party's personnel policy. [paragraph continues]

We should consider it in a broad social and political context, with due regard for the lessons of the past, the nature of the current moment and the tasks of the future.

The April plenary meeting and the 27th party congress prepared the ground for an objective critical analysis of the situation in society and took decisions of historic importance for the country's future. We have begun reorganization and will not look back. The first steps on that road have been taken.

Drawing an overall political conclusion, we can say with confidence that major changes are taking place in the life of Soviet society and that positive tendencies are gaining momemtum.

Before the plenary meeting, I myself and other Politburo members and Central Committee secretaries had many meetings and conversations with members of the Central Committee, public figures, workers, collective farmers, intellectuals, veterans and young people. The overall tenor and meaning of their statements was unambiguous: The policy line of renovating our society should be firmly pursued and efforts redoubled in every area.

The Central Committee finds it important that the policy line of the 27th congress, the practical efforts to fulfil it and reorganization itself have been given broad support by workers, by the entire Soviet people. Thanks, comrades, is the most important thing to a ruling party.

At the same time, we see that change for the better is taking place slowly, that the cause of reorganization is more difficult and the problems which have accumulated in society more deep-rooted than we first thought. The further we go with our reorganization work, the clearer its scope and significance become; more and more unresolved problems inherited from the past come out.

The main evaluations of the condition of society and the conclusions drawn from them by the Politburo have already been presented to the 27th party congress and plenary meetings of the Central Committee. They have been fully corroborated. But today we know more and that is why there is a need to examine once again and in detail the sources of the existing situation and to sort out the reasons for what took place in the country in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

This analysis is necessary to prevent mistakes from recurring and to fufil the resolutions of the congress, on which the future of our people and the destiny of socialism depend. It is all the more important since there still is some misunderstanding in society and in the party of the complexity of the situation in which the country has found itself. Perhaps, this also explains questions from some comrades about the measures that are being taken by the Politburo and the government in the course of reorganisation. We are often asked if we are not manoeuvering too sharp a turn.

We need utmost clarity on all the vital issues, including this one. Only an indepth understanding of the situation enables us to find correct approaches to complex tasks.

By and large, comrades, there is an urgent need to return to an analysis of those problems which confronted the party and Soviet society in the few years preceding the April 1986 plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee. The experience of the past 18 months bolstered our resolve to deepen that analysis, to understand the causes of negative processes and to work out measures to accelerate our progress, to keep us from repeating mistakes and to allow us only to advance, provoking in practice socialism's organic ability to continuously renovate itself. [PRAVDA reads: improve itself.]

The Politburo believes that it is precisely on the basis of this approach that we should hold the current plenary meeting.

1. Reorganization Is an Objective Necessity [subhead]

Comrades,

Our plenary meeting is taking place in the year of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Almost seven decades ago the Leninist party raised over the country the victorious banner of socialist revolution, of struggle for socialism, freedom, equality, social justice and societal progress and against oppression and exploitation, poverty and oppression of nationalities. [PRAVDA reads: poverty and national servitude (bespraviye).]

For the first time in world history the working man and his interests and needs were made the focal poiunt of state policy. The Soviet Union achieved truly epoch-making successes in political, economic, social, cultural and intellectual development as it built socialist society. Under the leadership of the party, the Soviet people built socialism, won the victory over Nazism [PRAVDA reads: fascism] in the Great Patriotic War, rehabilitated and strengthened the national economy and made their homeland a mighty power.

Our achievements are immense and indubitable and the Soviet people by right take pride in their successes. They constitute a firm base for the fulfillment of our current programmes and our plans for the future. But the party must see life in its entirety and complexity. No accomplishments, even the most impressive ones, should obscure either contradictions in societal development or our mistakes and failings.

We talked about all that and should repeat anew today: At some point the country began to lose momentum, difficulties and unresolved problems started to pile up, and there appeared elements of stagnation and other phenomena alien to socialism. All that badly affected the economy and social, cultural and intellectual life.

Of course, comrades, the country did not cease to develop. Tens of millions of Soviet people were working honestly and many party organizations and our cadre workers were energetically acting in the interests of the people. All that held back the intensification of negative processes but could not avert them altogether.

A need for change was coming to a head in the economy and other fields -- but it was not realized through the political and practical work of the party and the state.

What was the reason for that complex and controversial situation?

[PRAVDA reads: Objectively a need for change was coming to a head in the economy and other spheres, but it was not carried through in the political and practical work of the party and state.

[What was the reason for that complex and contradictory situation?]

The main cause -- and the Politburo considers it necessary to say so with utmost frankness at the plenary meeting -- was that the CPSU Central Committee and the leadership of the country failed, primarily for subjective reasons, to see in time and in full the need for change and the danger of the intensification of crisis phenomena in society and to formulate a clear policy for overcoming them and making better use of the opportunities intrinsic to the socialist system.

Conservative sentiments, inertia, a tendency to brush aside everything that did not fit into conventional patterns and an unwillingness to come to grips with outstanding socio-economic questions prevailed in policy-making and practical work.

Comrades, it is the leading bodies of the party and the state that bear responsibility for all this.

The extent to which vital problems and contradictions and societal tendencies and prospects were understood depended in many ways on the state and progress of theory, on the atmosphere in theoretical science.

Lenin's dictum that the value of a theory consists in its providing an exact picture "of all the contradictions that are present in reality" was often merely ignored. The theoretical concepts of socialism remained to a large extent at the level of the 1930s-1940., when society had been tackling entirely different tasks. Developing socialism, the dialectics of its motive forces and contradictions and the actual condition of society did not become the subject of in-depth scientific research.

The causes of the situation go back far into the past and are rooted in that specific historical situation in which by virtue of well-known circumstances vigorous debates and creative ideas disappeared from theory and social sciences while authoritarian evaluations and opinions became unquestionable truths, that could only be commented upon.

The forms of organization of society that had emerged in practice became absolutized in a way. Moreover, such ideas were actually equated to the essential characteristics of socialism, viewed as constant and presented as dogmas which left no room for objective scientific quest. [PRAVDA reads: scientific analysis.] There emerged an ossified concept of socialist relations of production, and their dialectic interrelation with the productive forces was underestimated. The social structure of society was portrayed schematically, as it were no contradictions or dynamism of the various interests of its different strata and groups. [sentence as received] [PRAVDA's sentence reads: The social structure of society was portrayed schematically, as if it were lacking the contradictions and dynamism of the various interests of its different strata and groups.]

Lenin's ideas of socialism were interpreted simplistically and their theoretical depth and significance were often left emaciated. This was true of such key problems as public property, relations between classes and nationalities, the measure of work and measure of consumption, cooperation, methods of economic management, people's rule and self-government, struggle against bureaucratic abuses, the revolutionarily transforming character of socialist ideology, the principles of education and upbringing, and guarantees for the healthy development of the party and society.

Spurious notions of communism and various prophecies and abstract views gained some currency. This detracted from the historical significance of socialism and from the influence of socialist ideology.

This attitude to theory could not help having an adverse effect -- and did have one -- on social sciences and their role in society. It is a fact, comrades, that all manner of scholastic theorizing, which did not affect anyone's interests and vital problems, where often even encouraged in the country, while attempts to carry out a constructive analysis and formulate new ideas were not supported.

The situation in theory adversely affected the solution of practical problems. Outdated methods were being perpetuated in the practice of economic management [PRAVDA here adds: and administration] over the decades while some efficient economic forms, conversely, were groundlessly rejected. At the same time relations which did not correspond to the real maturity of society and which in some instances came into conflict with its nature were being fostered in production and distribution. Production and [PRAVDA here adds: labor] incentive were actually oriented to quantitative, extensive growth.

Special mention should be made of socialist property. Control over who managed it and how had slackened off. It was often eroded by departmental and parochial attitudes and became "no one's," free, without any real master, and in many cases came to be used to derive unearned income.

There was an incorrect attitude to cooperative property, which was viewed as something "second-rate" and having no future. All this had grievous consequences for agrarian and social policies, bred management by decree in relations with collective farms and resulted in the eradication of procuring cooperatives. There also were grave misconceptions about personal subsidiary holdings and individual labour, which did much ecnomic and social harm as well.

Serious discrepancies kept piling up in planning. The authority of the plan as the main tool of economic policy was being subverted by subjective approaches, imbalances, instability, a striving to embrace everything down to trifles, and a host of decisions of a sectoral and regional character, taken in circumvention of the plan and often without due regard for realistic possibilities. Plans were often short on scientific substantiation and did not provide guidelines for the formation of efficient national economic proportions, proper care for the development of the social sphere and the accomplishment of many strategic tasks.

As a consequence, the huge advantage offered by the socialist economic system, primarily its planned character, was used inefficiently.

In this situation irresponsibility kept [as received] [PRAVDA reads: In this situation irresponsibility flourished] and diverse bureaucratic rules and instructions were devised. Day-to-day practical activity was replaced with rule by decree, a show of efficiency and mountains of paperwork.

Preconceptions about the role of monetary-commodity relations and the operation of the law of value and sometimes their being set in direct opposition to socialism as something alien led to voluntarist aproaches in the economy, the underestimation of cost-accounting, levelling out [PRAVDA places quotation marks around: levelling out] in pay and bred subjective approaches in price formation, breaches of money circulation and disregard for the regulation of supply and demand.

Restrictions on the cost-accounting rights of enterprises and amalgamations had especially grave consequences. They undermined the foundations of material incentive, blocked the achievement of high end results, and led to a lowering of the people's labour and social activity and to a slackening of discipline and order.

In fact, a whole system of weakening the economic tools of government emerged and there took shape a mechanism of braking socio-economic development and hindering progressive change which made it possible to tap and use the advantage of socialism. That braking process was rooted in serious shortcomings in the functioning of the institutes of socialist democracy, outdated political and theoretical concepts, that often did not correspond to reality, and conservative managerial machinery.

All that, comrades, adversely affected the development of many spheres in the life of society. Take material production. The growth rates of the national income in the past three five-year plan periods dropped by more than half. Most plan targets were not met since the early 1970s. The economy as a whole became cumbersome and relatively unreceptive to innovation. The quality of a considerable part of the output no longer met the current requirements, and imbalances in production became aggravated.

Attention to the development of engineering was slackened. Research and development work fell behind the needs of the national economy and did not meet the modernization demands. Purchases of equipment and many other commodities on the capitalist market were excessive and certainly not always justified.

Negative processes seriously affected the social sphere. The 27th party congress already gave an appraisal of its condition. The social goals of the economy in the past few five-year plan periods were obviously diluted and there emerged a sort of deafness to social issues. We see today that all this has led to.

Having successfully resolved the question of employment and provided basic social guarantees, we at the same time failed to realize in full the potential of socialism to improve housing conditions, food supply, of transport, health care and education and the solution of a number of other vital problems.

There emerged violations of the most important principle of socialism, distribution according to work. Efforts to control unearned income were indecisive. The policy of material and moral incentive to work efficiently was inconsistent. Large, unjustified bonuses and various additional incentives were paid and figure-padding for profit was allowed to take place. Parasitic sentiments grew stronger and the mentality of "wage levelling" began to take hold. All that hit at those workers who could and wanted to work better, while making life easier for the idle.

The violation of the organic relationship between the measure of work and measure of consumption not only disfigures the attitude to work, holding back the growth of productivity, but leads to distortion of the principle of social justice -- and that is a question of great political importance.

Elements of social corrosion that emerged in the last few years had a negative effect on society's morale and inconspicuously eroded the lofty moral values which have always been characteristic of our people and of which we are proud, namely, ideological and dedication [PRAVDA reads: ideological dedication], labour enthusiasm and Soviet patriotism.

As an inevitable consequence of all this, interest in the affairs of society slackened, manifestations of callousness and scepticism appeared and the rold of moral incentive to work declined. The stratum of people, some of them young people, whose ultimate goal in life was material well-being and gain by any means, grew wider. Their cynical stand was acquiring more and more aggressive forms, poisoning the mentality of those around them and triggering a wave of consumerism. The spread of alcohol and drug abuse and a rise in crime became indicators of the decline of social mores.

Disregard for laws, report-padding, bribe-taking and encouragement of toadyism and adulation had a deleterious influence on the moral atmosphere in society.

Real care for people, for the conditions of their life and work and for social well-being were often replaced with political flirtation -- the mass distribution of awards, titles and prizes. An atmosphere of permissiveness was taking shape, and exactingness, discipline and responsibility were declining.

Serious shortcomings in ideological and political education were in many cases disguised with ostentatious activities and campaigns and celebrations of numerous jubilees in the centre and in the provinces. The world of day-to-day realities and that of make-believe well-being were increasingly parting ways.

The ideology and mentality of stagnation had their effect on culture, literature and the arts. Criteria in appraising artistic creative work were reduced. As a consequence, there appeared quite a few mediocre, faceless works, which did not give anything to the mind or the heart, along with works which raised serious social and moral problems and relected true-to-live collisions. Stereotypes from capitalist mass culture with its propagation of vulgarity, primitive tastes and spiritual callousness began to infiltrate Soviet society to a larger extent.

I cannot help mentioning here the responsibility of our ideological agencies, editors of arts and literary journals, leaders of artistic union, literary critics, men of letters themselves and workers in the arts, for the ideological and artistic guidelines of the creative process and for the moral health of the people.

There was a lack of principledness, exactingness and true care for fostering and encouraging talent in the work of the artistic unions. Questions of paramount importance, relating to the state of affairs in and condition of culture, often failed to get adequate attention from the leaders of the unions. At the same time, red-tape and formalism flourished and extreme intolerance of criticism emerged. In some cases excessive ambitions began to take the upper hand over realistic appraisals and self-appraisals.

The situation was aggravated by the fact that the party approach to artistic work was often replaced by unwarranted departmental interference in purely creative processes and with sympathies and antipathies based on personal predilections, while methods of ideological influence and guidance gave way to administration by decree.

Comrades,

The condition of the party itself and its cadres also had an effect on the socio-economic and political situation that took shape in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

The leading party bodies failed timely and critically to appraise the danger of the growth of negative tendencies in society and in the conduct of some communists and to take decisions which life was imperatively demanding.

Although possessing immense potentialities and acting virtually in all work collectives, many primary party organizations failed to keep to positions of principle. By no means all these organizations waged a resolute struggle against negative phenomena, permissiveness, mutual protectionism, slackening of discipline and the spread of drunkenness. Departmentalism, parochialish and manifestations of nationalism were not always properly rebuffed.

Our party organizations sometimes lacked a combative spirit, exactingness towards party members and adequate attention to the development of ideological and political qualities in communists. Meanwhile, it is precisely high ideological standards, conscientiousness, readiness to subordinate one's personal interests to those of society and selfless service to the people that are the most valuable qualities which were always characteristic of the Bolsheviks.

The situation in the party was also influenced by the fact that in a number of cases the party bodies did not attach proper attention to strict compliance with the Leninist principles and norms of party life. This made itself especially manifest, perhaps, in breaches of the principles of collective leadership [PRAVDA here adds: in work]. What I mean is the weakening of the rold of party meetings and elective bodies, which denied communists the opportunity energetically to contribute to the discussion of vital issues and, in the last analysis, acutally to influence the atmosphere in work collectives and in society as a whole.

The principle of equality between communists was often violated. Many party members in senior executive positions were outside control or criticism, which resulted in failures in work and serious breaches of party ethics.

We cannot overlook the just indignation of working people at the conduct of those senior officials, in whom trust and authority bad been vested and who were called upon to stand guard over the interests of the state and of those citizens, who themselves abused their authority, suppressed criticism, sought gain, and some of whom even became accomplices in if not organizers of criminal activities.

Negative processes related to the degeneration of cadres and breaches of socialist laws manifested themselves in extremely ugly forms in Uzbekistan, Moldavia, Turkmenia, some regions of Kazakhstan, the Krasnodar Territory, the Rostov region, and also in Moscow, some other cities, regions, territories and republics, and in the systems of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Naturally, party organizations and the party as a whole were fighting those phenomena and expelled from the CPSU a considerable number of renegades. Among them were people guilty of embezzlement, bribe taking and report-padding, people who violated state and party discipline and indulged in heavy drinking.

The overwhelming majority of those who have joined the party are the best representatives of the working class, collective farmers [PRAVDA reads: peasantry] and intelligentsia. They have been honestly and selflessly performing their party duty. Yet we should admit that in those years there was no strong barrier put up in the way of dishonest, pushing, greedy people who were intent on benefitting from their party membership.

We deviated to some extent from the rule that the main thing was not the number of new members but the quality of the party ranks. And as a result the combativeness of party organizations was affected.

Everything said above, comrades, shows how serious the situation was in different spheres of society and how urgent was the need for deep changes. This makes it all the more important to stress once again that the party found in itself the strength and courage to take a sober view of the situation, to admit the need for drastic changes in policy, in the economy and social, cultural and intellectual fields and to steer the country onto the road of change.

It was in this situation, comrades, that the question of accelerating the socio-economic development of the country, the question of reorganization was raised. The case in point is actually a radical turn and measures of a revolutionary character. As we talk about reorganization and associated processes of deep-going democratisation of society, we mean truly revolutionary and comprehensive transformations in society.

We need to make this decisive turn because we just don't have the choice of another way. We must not retreat and do not have anywhere to retreat to. We must steer the course charted by the April plenum of the Central Committee and the 27th congress consistently and unswervingly, go further on and take society to a qualitatively new level of development.

When starting social change, it is imperative, as Vladimir Lenin taught, to know the answers to the question: "How is this change to be explained and what are the limits of its practical application?" Criticism of the past -- an important part of progress -- makes it possible to draw lessons and conclusions for today and tomorrow and facilitates the constructive work of choosing the right ways and means of making headway.

We have evolved a scientifically valid speedup strategy, being clearly aware that any rashness or spontaneity in shaping the notions of the future are no less dangerous than inertia and dogmatic distortions.

Today it is essential to say once again what we mean by reorganization.

Reorganization is a decisive reversal of the processes of stagnation, destruction of the braking mechanism, and the creation of a dependable and efficient machinery for expediting the social and economic progress of Soviet society.

The main purport of our strategy is to combine the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with a plan-based economy and swing the entire potential of socialism into action.

Reorganization is reliance on the creative endeavor of the masses, all-round extension of democracy and socialist self-government, encouragement of initiative and self-organised activities, better discipline and order, greater openness, criticism and self-criticism in all fields of public life, and high respect for the value and dignity of the individual.

Reorganization is the ever greater role of intensive growth factors in Soviet economic development, reinstatement and enhancement of the Leninist principles of democratic centralism in the management of the national economy, employment of cost-benefit methods [PRAVDA reads: employment of economic methods] of management everywhere, renunciation of the domineering style of management and administration by decree, conversion of all units of the economy to the principles of full-scale economic accountability and new forms of organising labour and production, and every kind of incentive for innovation and socialist enterprise.

Reorganization is a decisive turn to science, the businesslike partnership of science and practice in the name of the highest possible end results, ability to ground any undertaking on a sound scientific basis, readiness and keen desire on the part of scientists to assist the party's policy of revitalising society, and concern for scientific advancement, for increasing the number of research personnel, and for making them actively involved in the process of change.

Reorganization means the priority development of the social sphere, ever fuller meeting soviet people's requirements for adequate working and living conditions, recreational facilities, education and medical services. It means unfailing concern for raising the intellectual and cultural standards of every person and of society as a whole, it is the ability to combine decision-making on the major, cardinal problems of public life with that on the current issues of immediate interest to the people.

Reorganization means vigorously ridding society of any deviations from socialist morals, consistent enforcement of the principles of social justice, harmony between words and deeds, indivisibilty of rights and duties, promotion of conscientious, high-quality work, and overcoming of pay-levelling and consumerism.

The final aim of the reorganization effort is, I believe, clear: It is to effect thorough-going change in all aspects of public life [PRAVDA here adds: in the country], to give socialism the most advanced forms of social organisation, and bring out the humane nature of our system in all decisive aspects -- economic, social, political and moral -- to the fullest possible degree.

This is, comrades, the job we have launched. The reorganization effort is unfolding along the entire front. It is acquiring a new quality not only gaining in scope but also penetrating the deepest fibre of life.

The drive for change has stirred all healthy forces in society to action and given people greater confidence in what they are doing. An objective and self-critical attitude to the state of things, departure from the cut-and-dried, well-beaten ways of going about their work, and the search for new, off-beat solutions to problems have become typical of more and more party committees, mass organisations and worker collectives.

We feel the solid and decisive backing of workers and peasants, intellectuals in the arts, science and engineering, of all sections of Soviet society.

A new moral atmosphere is shaping in the country. A re-appraisal of values and their creative re-thinking is under way, debates have opened on ways of re-organising the economy and social and cultural life, and the quest for new methods of organisational and ideological work has been gaining in scope. Public openness and candour in judging phenomena and developments, intolerance of shortcomings, and the desire to secure improvements have been increasingly affirming themselves as effective principles of life.

Standards have been going up, discipline and production organisation improving, and more order introduced. The first steps in re-organising cultural and intellectual life are especially important to us, comrades, because we cannot hope to succeed without decisively changing public mentality and remoulding popular psychology, thinking and sentiment.

We have begun to overhaul the material and technological base and the national economy on the basis of [PRAVDA here adds: fundamentally] progress in research and engineering and to update structural and investment policies. Far-reaching target programmes have been adopted in the decisive areas of scientific and technological progress. These programmes have been taken into account in drawing up the 12th 5-Year Plan which is now being carried out.

Large-scale measures are bveing implemented to streamline management. From the start of this year all industrial works and amalgamations have been switched over to experimentally tried-and-tested methods of economic managment. A number of industires, amalgamations and factories have been converted to the system of full-scale economic accountability and self-financing.

The branches of the economy directly involved in supplying popular needs such as the agro-industrial sector, light industry, trade and the services have begun operating on principles that give them more leeway, while increasing their accountability. Fundamental change is taking place in the way the capital construction industry is run. A state-controlled quality inspection system has been introduced at 1,500 major factories with a view to improving product quality.

The system of foreign economic activities is being restructured. The rights of factories and industries in this field have been broadened. New forms of cooperation, including direct relations between enterprises, joint ventures, and specialised-production and co-production schemes with foreigh partners, continue gaining ground.

With the aim of adopting an integrated system for running the national economy, standing agencies have been set up at the USSR Council of Ministers to manage groups of inter-related industries. A law on the state enterprise (amalgamation) has been drafted and work is proceeding to draw up documents on ways of optimising the functions of central economic bodies, ministries and departments to fit in with the new economic machinery and evolve proposals on organising new forms of large production units based on individual and amalgamated factories and operating on cost-accounting principles, and on a number of other important matters.

Fundamental measures are being realised to improve things in the social field. New principles have been worked out, and are being implemented, for raising pay in productive spheres. We have taken the unwavering course of abandoning wage-levelling and consistently maintaining the socialist principle of distribution in accordance with the quantity of one's work.

At the same time unwarranted restrictions on individual enterprise have been lifted and favourable conditions are now being provided to promote this kind of work activity. People are being encouraged to set up cooperatives in various areas of production and services to meet consumer demand more fully.

Following up an analysis of the situation in housing construction and considering the fundamental task of providing every family with a separate apartment by the year 2000, extra reserves have been found to quicken the pace, and improve the quality, of home building. An additional 10 per cent of capital investments are being earmarked for this purpose, which will make it possible as early as 1987 to increase the amount of housing construction by 9.1 million square meters, or nearly 8 per cent, as compared with the target in the five-year plan.

The scale of home building by cooperatives and individuals is growing. Easy-tern credits are being offered and the necessary resources made available, and measures are being adopted, for example, to promote the economic methods of building homes by factories from their own funds and to increase the capacity of the construction industry.

A programme has been drawn up for building and modernising medical institutions, more facilities have been built to produce pharmaceuticals and medical equipment, and efforts to introduce and promote new forms of medical services and develop medical science have been stepped up. Measures have also been taken [PRAVDA here adds: inorganic link with this] to improve people's working and daily-living conditions, extend the system of preventive treatment, eradicate drunkenness and alcoholism, and reduce sickness rates. Medical workers are having their pay increased.

So even a brief review of the work that has been planned and started, comrades, demonstrates the immense sweep of the re-organisation effort under way across the land. The amount of work facing us is enormous but there is no way that it can be avoided. The party does not [as received] [PRAVDA here adds: have] the right to slacken attention to any aspect of the projected changes. All plans must be carried out without fail, to the point and on time.

Of course, some of the measures we're working out and realising will only yield practical results after some time. But even today the very atmosphere and new public mood are already changing attitudes to work and bringing about practical, palpable results.

This is borne out, among other things, by the results of work to fulfill the plan for the first year of the current five-year plan period.

Material national income went up 4.1 per cent as against 3.9 per cent in the plan and as compared with the annual average of 3.6 per cent in the previous five years. Industrial production crew 4.9 per cent, which is a third more than the average annual increase in the previous five-year period and makes the highest growth rate for the past nine years.

You know that the 12th 5-Year Plan period is of decisive significance to us in terms of modernising the country's machine-building sector, updating production assets and speeding up scientific and technological progress. The effort to ensure priority development of the machine-building sector has had to cope with great difficulties but nevertheless it is going on. In the past year the production of industrial robots went up 14 per cent, that of flexible automated production systems 160 per cent, production modules 120 per cent, and integrated machine systems 40 per cent. Capital inputs in re-tooling and reconstruction of existing mechanical-engineering factories grew 30 percent. The Politburo will keep constant watch over how the programme concerning the machine-building sector is being fulfilled. We hope that machine-builders will cope with the tasks set to them.

Things are looking up also in a number of other industries. The results shown last year in non-ferrous metallurgy [PRAVDA reads: ferrous metallurgy], coal mining and the gas industry were not bad and the ground lost in oil production was also being made up.

Labour productivity in industry [PRAVDA here adds: as a whole] rose 4.6 percent as compared with the planned target of 4.1 percent. This increase accounted for 96 percent of the gain in output in 1986. Net production costs dropped noticeably for the first time in many years. The turnover rate of material assets went up, while the stocks of uninstalled plant, including imported equipment, were reduced.

Improvements in the agrarian sector are there for all to see. As compared with the average annual harvests [PRAVDA reads: annual indicators] in the past five-year period, grain production in 1986 increased by almost 30 million tonnes, or 17 percent, potatoes by nearly 9 million tonnes, or 11 percent, sugar beet close on 3 million tonnes, or 4 percent, meat 1.5 million tonnes, or 9 percent, milk 6.5 million tonnes, or 7 percent, and eggs by almost 6,000 million, or 8 percent.

As you see comrades, agricultural output has begun to grow, something we have not seen in most decisive indices for many years. However, it must be said that the growth in output of such products as vegetables, fruits, sunflower and cotton was either insignficant or zero.

It is also important to note the improvement of the main financial and economic indices in the performance of collective farms and state farms. Labour productivity in the socialised economy increased during the year by 6.9 percent, the profit rate amounted to 19 percent and profits went up by two billion roubles.

While noting the positive changes in the development of the economy it should be said however that the plan for the year setting targets for the growth of national income used for consumption and accumulation was not fulfilled because of big losses and non-productive outlays and non-fulfillment of asssignments to expand trade turnover.

The increments of such key indices as real per capita incomes of the population, gross agricultural output, manufacture of consumer goods by industry, volume of capital investments and introduction of fixed assets into operation, and profit fell short of plan assignments despite a substantial increase as compared to the previous year. Neither have there occurred serious changes in the investment process. Only two thirds of the projects included in the nomenclature of the state plan were put into service.

Changes in the social sphere have begun after all but with great difficulty. The number of accidents and loss of working time have declined for the first time since the 1960s after the measures taken to strengthen discipline and combat alcohol abuse.

The total number of crimes has dropped by almost a quarter and the number of grave crimes by a third. The fight against violations of law and order has been intensified everywhere.

The volume of housing construction has grown and this has made it possible to surpass the 1985 figure by 5.2 million square metres. More kindergartens and nurseries, schools, outpatient clinics and hospitals, cultural institutions and service establishments have been built.

In short, there are positive changes. But the weight of problems that have accumulated in this important sphere is too great and we are still too timid in tackling them.

As you know, it was with great difficulty that reserves were found to expand construction of housing, cultural institutions and service establishments. But alas not everyone made proper use of these possibilities. Many construction plans were not fulfilled. The reasons for this should be sought not only in the lack of organisation of builders but also in insufficient attention from enterprises, ministries, local soviets and party committees.

We still have difficulties with trade in foodstuffs and manufactured goods, with urban trasport and the utilities, with institutions of public health care and culture. In short, we have not yet achieved fundamental changes in the development of the social sphere and remain largely in the power of old approaches.

Concluding my description of the work conducted by the party, by the entire people to execute the decisions of the 27th congress I would like to say the following:

It is very important for us, members of the Central Committee, to take a realistic stand to make an objective assessment of what has been done, to view the obtained results not just from past positions but above all proceeding from our announced plans and promises made to the people. This is the only correct party approach.

We must clearly realise that we are only at the initial stage of the restructuring. The main and most complex work is yet to come. We must advance persistently, step by step, without wavering. We must soberly assess what has been done. We must not be afraid to rectify mistakes. We must search for and find new ways and means of solving tasks as they arise and definitely achieve advance towards the set goals.

We should absolutely master the lesson of the past -- that no gap should be allowed to form between decisions and practical work to implement them. There should be no conceit and self-complacency. I am saying this once again because we encounter this even now.

We must act, act and once again act -- vigorously, boldly, creatively and competently.

The need to pose the question thusly is dictated by the fact that to this day in many economic, government, state and even party bodies, and in work collectives themselves far from everyone is marching in step with the demands of life. There are quite a few people who are slow in throwing off the burden of the past, who are adopting a wait-and-see attitude and openly putting a spoke in the wheel, impeding the extensive development of the people's political, public and labour activity.

Not all have understood that to work in the new way means to resolutely give up old habits and methods. In the long run this depends on the civic stand of every person, on a conscientious attitude to the job entrusted one, to one's duties, and we are all responsible for this to the party, the country and our own conscience.

Meetings and conversations with working people, with party and economic cadres show that the reorganization is receiving ardent support. It can be said that the people are all for reorganization. But what attracts attention is that many people, while supporting innovations, believe that people must reorganize somewhere higher up, that this has to be done by others -- by party, state and economic bodies, other branches of the economy, allied enterprises, by others in the production shop, on the farm or building site. In short, this must be done by everybody excerpt themselves.

No, comrades, while justly demanding reorganization at every level, each of us must begin with himself. Everybody -- workers, collective farmers, intellectuals, in short everybody, from the work collective to the Central Committee on the CPSU and the government must work in a new way -- vigorously, creatively and, I repeat, conscientiously.

In the immense undertaking of reorganization we, Communists, rely above all on a high degree of awareness and organisation, social initiative and the major labour accomplishments of the working class, the leading political force of our society.

While thinking highly of the party's course of reorganization, the working class, all Soviet people at the same time express concern about the course of the way it is being implemented in practice. They call on the party not to stop, to act resolutely, to advance and undeviatingly implement the adopted course.

From this, comrades, we must draw political conclusions.

Since such concern exists in society it means that our efforts are still insufficient, it means that we are not yet acting with necessary effectiveness and vigour everywhere and in everything. It means that the measures that are being taken and the work that is being done do not accord everywhere with the scope and acuteness of the accumulated problems, that not everything is being done as well as is demanded by the times.

This means, comrades, that the Central Committee has a substantial reason for analysis and drawing the essential conclusions.

We understand of course that the process of overcoming existing stereotypes of thinking and acting is a complex and painful process requiring time and a balanced approach.

It is absolutely clear that this process cannot proceed autonomously, in isolation form the transformations in political, socio-economic and spiritual life.

We must clearly realise that today a whole system of measures is needed. This includes the formulation of theoretical provisions based on the realities of our time and a deeply subtantiated scientific forecast of the future, changes in social consciousness and a consistent development of democratic institutions, fostering the political culture of the masses and the reorganization of the mechanism of economic management, of organisational structures and, of course, the pursuance of a vigorous social policy.

This is the only way to remove the mechanism holding back progress and to give the necessary scope to the forces of acceleration.

I think today's plenary meeting of the Central Committee should tell the party and the people that a difficult struggle lies ahead, requiring of every Communist and every citizen a high degree of consciousness and organisation, tenacity and utmost selflessness.

Comrades, the analysis of the state our society was in on the eve [as received] [PRAVDA reads: the analysis of the state of our society on the eve] of the April plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the experience of reorganization have raised with all acuteness a most important question.

Do we have guarantees that the process of transformations that we have started will be continued to the end, that the former mistakes will not be repeated and can we ensure the full-blooded development of our society?

The Political Bureau answers these questions in the affirmative: Yes, we have such guarantees.

These are the single will, the joint actions of the party and people united by past experience, by awareness of responsibility for the present and the future of the socialist homeland.

These are the all-round development of the democratism of the socialist system, the real and ever more active participation of the people in solving all questions of the country's life, the full restoration of the Leninist principles of openness, public control, criticism and self-criticism, and sincerity in policy consisting of the unity of words and deeds.

Finally, these are the healthy developments of the party itself, its ability to critically analyse its own activity, its capacity to renovate the forms and methods of its work, to determine on the basis of revolutionary theory the prospects of development of society and struggle to solve the new tasks life poses.

It is precisely the deepening of socialist democratism, the creative endeavor of Soviet people, the vanguard role of Communists in practical deeds that will ensure both the success and the irreversibility of the revolutionary transformations mapped out by the 27th congress.

II. To Deepen Socialist Democratisation and Develop Self-Government by the People [subhead]

Comrades,

We now understand better than before the entire depth of Lenin's thought about the vital, inner link between socialism and democracy.

The entire historical experience of our country has convincingly demonstrated that the socialist system has in practice ensured citizens' political and socio-economic rights, their personal freedoms, and demonstrated the advantages of Soviet democracy and given each person confidence in the morrow.

But in conditions of reorganization, when the task of intensifying the human factor has become so urgent, we must return once again to Lenin's approach to the question of the maximum democratism of the socialist system under which people feel that they are their own masters and creators.

"We must be guided by experience, we must allow complete freedom to the creative faculties of the masses", Vladimir Lenin said.

Indeed, democracy the essence of which is the power of the man of labour is the form of realising his extensive political and civil rights, his interest in tranformations and practical participation in their implementation.

A simple and lucid thought is becoming increasingly entrenched in social consciousness: A house can be put in order only by a person who feels that he owns this house. This truth is correct not only in the worldly sense but also in the socio-political one.

This truth must be undeviatingly applied in practice. I repeat, in practice. Otherwise the human factor will be ineffective.

It is only through the consistent development of the democratic forms inherent in socialism, through a broadening of self-government that our advancement in production, science and technology, literature, culture and the arts, in all areas of social life is possible. It is only this way that ensures conscientious discipline. The reorganization itself is possible only through democracy and due to democracy. It is only this way that it is possible to give scope to socialism's most powerful creative force -- free labour and free thought in a free country.

Therefore the further democratisation of Soviet society is becoming the party's urgent task. Herein, properly speaking, lies the essence of the course of the April plenum, of the 27th Congress of the CPSU for deepening socialist self-government by the people. The point at issue is, certainly, not any break up of our political system We should make use with maximum effectiveness of all its potentialities, fill the work of the party, the soviets and the government bodies, public organizations and work collectives with deep democratic contents, breathe new life into all cells of the social organism.

This process is already under way in the country. The life of the party organizations is becoming more full-blooded. Criticism and self-criticism are broadening The mass media have begun working more actively. The Soviet people can sense the salutary effect of public openness, which is becoming a norm of society's life.

The congresses of creative unions proceeded in an atmopshere of principledness and criticism. New public organizations are being set up. The all-union organization of war and labour veterans has come into being. The Soviet cultural foundation has been set up Work is under way to set up women's councils. All these facts indicate the growing participation of the working people in social affairs, in the administration of the country

What ways does the Political Bureau see for further deepening of Soviet society's democratism?

We will be able to boost effectively people's initiative and creativity if our democratic institutions vigorously and effectively influence the state of things in ecery work collective, whether it concerns planning, organization of labour, distribution of material and other benefits, or selection and promotion of the most authoritative and competent people to leading positions.

It can confidently be said that the sooner every Soviet citizen feels these changes in his or her own experience, the more active his or her civic positions and participation in public and state affairs will be.

The development of democracy in production is of paramount significance, the consistent introduction of genuine self-administration principles in the labour effort of work collectives. The economy is the decisive area of society's life. Tens of millions of people are daily engaged there. [paragraph continues]

Therefore the development of democracy in production is the most important trend in deepening and broadening socialist democracy as a whole. This is a lever, which will make it possible to ensure the broad and active participation of the working people in all areas of social life and make it possible to avoid many blunders and miscalculations.

The most important practical objective is to create such conditions and introduce such forms of organization of production, which will enable every working person to feel himself or herself true masters of the enterprise.

And this is a lofty and responsible position. It not only gives one broad rights in the real administration of affairs, but also presupposes great responsibility for all that is happening in the work collective.

Diverse forms of participation of the working people in production management have asserted themselves in the course of building socialism. The life of work collectives is unthinkable without the party, trade union, Young Communist League and other public organizations. The role of workers' meetings and collective agreements has been growing of late. New forms of democracy, such as the councils of production teams and workshops, have originated and conditions have ripened also for further steps along that way.

Life itself has placed on the order of the day the need for drawing up such a fundamental legal act as the law of the state enterprise, whose draft has already been issued to you. That law is designed to change radically the conditions and methods of management in the main section [PRAVDA reads: main link] of the economy, to consolidate in the activities of enterprises the combination of the principle of planning and full cost accounting, independence and responsibility, to make law the new forms of self-administration born of the creativity of the masses.

The law is intended to put into practice one of the most important directives of the party congress, that is the line towards effective use of direct democracy. The powers to be given under the draft law to the general meetings and councils of work collectives in resolving questions in connection with production, social and personal affairs, will be a major political measure in proceeding, as V.I. Lenin put it, "to genuine self-government by the people".

The consistent implementation of the law on the state enterprise in combination with the package of measures being implemented now in the economic field will, we believe, altogether create a new situation in the economy, will become an accelerator of economic development and lead to the qualitative perfection of many aspects of social life. Considering the tremendous significance of that law, the Political Bureau proposes that it be submitted for nation-wide discussion. I believe that the members of the Central Committee will support this proposal.

Our collective farms, socialist cooperation as a whole have broad potentialities, that as yet are far from being fully used, for democratising management of the economy and the social sphere.

The restructuring of the system of administration in the agri-industrial complex and the decision on further development of cooperation in other sectors of the economy create good prerequisites for making use of these potentialities. In that connection it would be advisible, in our view, to convene a new congress of collective farmers to discuss the overripe problems of life of collective farms and make the necessary amendments to the model charter of the collective farms.

The Political Bureau actively supports the practical steps already undertaken in many republics, territories and regions to broaden other cooperative forms of activity. This will make it possible to meet even more fully the growing demand of the population for many commodities and services, and also create additional conditions for the development of democracy in the economic fields, for better realisation of man's opportunities.

It is necessary, comrades, to overcome the vacillation as regards the cooperative movement, which existed in the past and can still be observed to this day.

Far from its potentialities being exhausted, cooperation holds out great prospects.

Why am I returning to this issue and laying accent on it? Because after the 27th Congress of the CPSU, depsite the decisions taken by the Central Committee and the government on the development of cooperation in the field of material and technical supply, consumer services and public catering, municipal economy, local industry and construction, this matter has not been given due scope. All sorts of obstacles are being put in its way, the commitment to administrative-bureaucratic methods of management is still strong, as is rejection of forms of management, which are out of tune with the concepts that have traditionally taken shape, even if these are vital and stimulate the initiative of the working people and enhance their social activeness.

Some comrades, apparently, find it hard to understand that democratism is not just a slogan but the essence of the reorganization. They must change their views and habits so as not to find themselves aside from the mainstream of life. This is our persistent advice to all who are still doubting and slow.

It is [PRAVDA here adds: especially] necessary to single out the question of the electiveness of heads of enterprises, factories, workshops, departments, sections, farms and teams, teams leaders and foremen. The present-day stage in restructuring, transition to new methods of economic management, cost-accounting, self-financing and self-repayment make that task a very practical one. This is an important and indispensable measure, and it will undoubtedly, meet with the working people's approval.

We have embarked in a big way on the path of transferring enterprises to full cost accounting, self-financing and self-repayment; we have introduced state quality control. This means that the profits of enterprises, all forms of incentives for the members of the work collective, the degree to which social demands are met will totally depend on the ultimate results of the work, the quality and quantity of the products made and the services rendered

Under these circumstances workers and collective farmers are far from being indifferent about who heads the enterprise, workshop, section and team. Since the wellbeing of the collective is made dependent on the abilities of the managers, the working people should also have real opportunities to influence the election process and control their activities.

Certain experience in open, public selection of management [PRAVDA here adds: has been] gained in the country. Thus more than eight and a half thousand senior executives have been promoted in the Krasnodar Territory since 1983 with due regard for the opinion of the collectives and primary party organizations. Yet [PRAVDA here adds: more than] 200 candidates did not have the support of the working people and were rejected. The same kind of experience has also been acquired in a number of other places. It has been received favourably by the people and is having a positive effect on the results of work.

To sum it all up, comrades, from whatever viewpoint we may approach that important matter, we cannot help drawing one conclusion: The time has come for change, for democratising the process of management formation at enterprises on the basis of all-round application of the effectiveness principle [PRAVDA reads: elective principles]. This, as you understand, means a qualitatively new situation, a completely altered form of participation by the working people in the management of production, an essential enhancement of the role and responsibility of the collective for the results of its activities.

All this should be taken into account in the course of the practical resolution of that issue. Yet I would like to convey one idea right now.

The point at issue is one-man management. We think that electiveness, far from undermining, on the contrary enhances the authority of the leader, who feels the support of the people who elected him, enhances the feeling of responsibility for the state of affairs, mutual exactingness and encourages high standards in the collective.

The role of the party, public organizations and economic management bodies should be comprehended in a new way. A great amount of work is to be carried out to inculcate in all our cadres a correct understanding of the fact that expansion of democracy in production presupposes an organic combination of one-man command and collective effort, a deepening of democratic centralism and development of self-administration.

The Political Bureau considers the perfection of the Soviet election system to be one of the main avenues in democratising our life. Corresponding proposals are being drafted on that issue on the instructions of the 27th congress.

What can be said in that connection? The existing election system ensures representation for all sections of the population in the elected organs of power.

The working class, collective farmers, intellectuals, women and men, veterans and young people, all nationalities, large and small, in the country are represented in the present soviets at all levels.

The elective bodies reflect the social, professional and national structure of Soviet society and the diversity of the interests of the entire population. This in itself is an immense achievement of socialist democracy.

But, just like all political, economic and social institutions, the electoral system should not remain hard set and uninvolved in the reorganization and new processes developing in society.

What is the essence of proposals and wishes on these matters, which [PRAVDA here adds: working] people are sending in to the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and to other central bodies and the mass media?

From the political point of view, it is a question of deepening the democratism of the electoral system and of more effective and active participation of the electorate at all stages of the pre-election and election campaigns.

Concretely, most proposals suggest that voters at meetings in work collectives and at the places of residence, as well as at election meetings, discuss, as a rule, several candidacies, that elections be held in larger electoral districts, and that several deputies be elected from each of them.

People [PRAVDA reads: comrades] believe that this would enable each citizen to express his or her attitude to a broader circle of candidates and will enable party and local government bodies to get to know better the sentiments and will of the population.

Responding to these wishes we should look anew at the way the elections themselves are organised and at the practice of nomination and discussion of candidacies for people's deputies. It is essential to rid the voting procedure of formalism and to see to it that the election campaign already this year be held in an atmosphere of broader democratism and interested participation of people in the process.

As far as a legislative act on introducing adjustments to the electoral system is concerned, it would be useful to publish its draft for preliminary discussion by all the people.

The implementation of these proposals would be the first important step towards further democratisation of the process of forming the bodies of state power and of their functioning. But, obviously, it is also necessary to consider deeper changes and further steps in this direction. With due regard for the experience gained and the new tasks we must once again take a thorough and deep look into Lenin's legacy on matters of Soviet state development and to draw on it in the solution of the tasks that society is faced with now.

It is quite natural that matters aimed at broadening inner-party democracy should be considered within the overall course of further democratisation of Soviet society.

[PRAVDA here adds: As is known,] A number of important provisions aimed at strengthening the democratic principles of the party's life were introduced at the 27th congress by means of the changes and additions to the CPSU rules. This work should be continued. It appears advisable to take counsel about the refinement of the mechanism of forming leading party bodies. Many different proposals have come in to the Central Committee in this connection. Allow me to report on the conclusions which have been drawn on the basis of the generalisation of the proposals.

To begin with, the formation of elective bodies in the primary party organisation. The gist of most proposals on this score is to give full scope to the expression of the will of all Communists without exception during the election of secretaries of party bureaus and party committees and in raising their accountability to those who elect them.

There is also a need to think of changing the procedure for the election of secretaries of district, area, city, regional and territorial committees of the party, and the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics. Here comrades suggest that secretaries, including first ones, could be elected by secret ballot at the plenary sessions of the respective party committees. In that case the members of the party committee would have a right to enter any number of candidacies in the voting list. Such measure should seriously raise the responsibility of secretaries to the party committees that elected them, give them more confidence in their work, and make it possible to determine more accurately the degree of their prestige.

Of course, the principle of the party rules, under which the decisions of higher bodies are compulsory for all lower party committees, including those on personnel matters, should remain unshakable in the party.

The Political Bureau's opinion is that further democratisation should also apply to the formation of the central leading bodies of the party. I think this is quite logical. It would seem logical to democratise the elections of leading bodies in other public organisations as well.

Comrades, I think you will agree that all these measures will strengthen the principles of democratic centralism in the party's life and will promote stronger unity and cohesion of the party ranks, greater discipline, responsibility, and activity of each communist, all party organisations, and the party as a whole.

The following questions will possibly arise: Shall we not be complicating the procedure of formation of the elective bodies of the party, to what extent is all this justified, and in what measure will it facilitate matters?

Ever since the April plenary meeting of the Central Committee we have been continuously emphasising that the problems which have accumulated in society are connected to a considerable extent with the drawbacks in the activity of the party itself and in its personnel policy.

The Political Bureau holds that the further democratisation of the process of forming elective bodies is one of the important conditions for boosting party activities, for infusion of fresh blood, the active work of party organisations, and a safeguard against a repetition of the errors of the past.

Elections within the party are not a formal act, and we should approach their preparation in a well-considered way, in the spirit of high responsibility, proceeding from the interests of the party and society.

The democratisation of society poses anew the question of control over how the party, local-government and economic bodies and their personnel work. As far as control "from above" is concerned, marked changes, as you know, hve occurred in this respect of late. So-called 'forbidden subjects' for criticism and control are receding into the past. The Political Bureau and the secretariat of the Central Committee at their meetings regularly hear reports by the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics, territorial and regional committees of the party, and consider other fundamental questions of the life of the party and society in-depth and comprehensively. The Council of Ministers of the USSR and its Presidium have begun to make much more exacting demands on ministries and departments and on the Councils of Ministers of the Union Republics.

Although, frankly speaking, the Political Bureau, the Secretariat of the Central Committee and the government have still a lot to do in this respect. We still have to revert to one and the same question several times over and to take additional measures to secure its solution. This has been vividly shown, in particular, by the discussion at the latest meeting of the Political Bureau on the course of implementation of the resolutions of the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the USSR on accelerating the development of machine-building. We take the necessary decisions but, as before, we do not implement them to the full and on time. This happens also because many not yet got rid of the burden of old habits and an irresponsible attitude to their duties. Discipline is lax. Far from all executives follow the principle of the unity of words and deeds, while others speak more than work. We must draw the most serious conclusions from that.

But with all the importance of control "from above", it is of fundamental importance in the conditions of the democratisation of society to raise the level and effectiveness of control "from below" so that each executive and each official constantly feel their responsibility to and dependence on the electorate, on the work collectives, public organisations, on the party and the people as a whole.

The main thing in this respect is to create and strengthen all instruments and forms of real control by the working people.

What instruments and forms do I have in mind?

Accountability, first of all. The time has come strictly to observe rules for systematic accountability by all elected and appointed officials to work collectives and to the population. It is necessary that ech such report be accompanied with a lively and principles discussion, criticism and self-criticism and businesslike proposals, and end with an evaluation of the activities of the person giving an account of his work.

That will be the implementation in practice of Lenin's behest that the work of elective bodies and executives be open to everyone and be done in sight of the masses of people. If we achieve such control, there can be no doubt that many causes for complaints and messages to higher organizations will disappear, and most questions raised in them will be solved at local level. In the conditions of extensive democratism, people themselves will put things in order in their work collective, town, or village.

The Soviets of people's deputies, trade unions and other public organisations have immense resources for control. In the supreme and local soviets it is necessary to strengthen the democratic principles of the work of the sessions, standing commissions and deputies and to raise the efficiency of regular accountability of officials to the soviets and the practice of inquiries by deputies. Such an approach will even further augment the prestige of the bodies of people's power among the masses.

While refining control, it is necessary to regulate without delay the veritable avalanche of all imaginable kinds of check-up and inspection at enterprises, institutions and organizations, inspections which distract people from work and introduce an element of nervousness into the work. The actual value of such check-ups or inspections is, as a rule, negligible. These issues are not new. They have repeatedly been spoken of and written about. But the state of affairs has not changed so far. It would seem that the Secretariat of the Central Committee and the Presidium of the Council of Ministers of the USSR should straighten out these matters, and follow the principle of quality, not quantity, of such inspections.

While normalising the atmosphere in society, it is essential to further encourage openness. This is a powerful lever for improving work at all levels of our development and an effective form of control by the whole people. The experience which has been gained since the April plenary meeting of the Central Committee is a good confirmation of that.

Evidently, the time has come to begin elaborating legal acts guaranteeing openness. These should ensure maximum openness in the activities of state and public organisations and give the working people a real opportunity to express their opinions on any aspect of society.

Criticism and self-criticism are a tested instrument of socialist democracy. There would seem to be no open objections to that. However, in real life we encounter facts indicating that not everyone by any means has become aware of the need to support the critical frame of mind in society. Matters at times go so far that some officials regard even the slightest remarks as an encroachment upon their prestige and defend it in any way they can. Far more experienced ones have also appeared. They admit the justness of criticism and will even thank you for it, but are not in a hurry to eliminate drawbacks, expecting to get away with it as usual.

Such an attitude to criticism has nothing in common with our principles and ethics. At the present stage, when we are asserting new approaches in socio-political life, in the cultural and intellectual sphere, [PRAVDA reads: Life, in the spiritual sphere,] the importance of criticism and self-criticism grows immeasurably.

People's attitude to criticism is an important criterion of their attitude to restructuring, to everything new that is taking place in society.

And here I cannot but say regretfully that we continue encountering not only cases of non-acceptance of criticism but also facts of persecution for it, of direct suppression of criticism. Not infrequently this assumes such proportions and takes place in such forms that the Central Committee has to intervene in order to reestablish the truth and justice and to support honest people who take the interests of work close to heart.

I have already spoken of this matter, but things are only slowly improving. Take, for instance, materials from the central press for January and you'll see that persecution of people for criticism is far from being a rare thing.

In this connection we must support the efforts of the mass media to develop criticism and self-criticism in our society. Their position in the struggle for restructuring has been appreciated by Soviet people.

The readership of central newspapers and magazines has increased by over 14 million people and central television programmes on topical subjects are attracting audiences of many millions. People are impressed by the bold and profound treatment of urgent problems involved in acceleration of the socio-economic development of the country and affecting different aspects of life in our society. The party believes that the materials of the mass media will continue to be marked by depth and objectivity and a high sense of civic responsibility.

There are some things to say about positive changes taking place in republican and local publications. But far from all of them have joined in the work of restructuring in a real way. Some of them lack firmness of principle and boldness in raising questions and a critical attitude to shortcomings. Many party committees sometimes fail to use in a proper way the mass media, this powerful lever of restructuring, and at some places continue paralysing ther activity.

While continuing to count on principles and constructive criticism of shortcomings and omissions, the party expects the mass media to publicise more widely the experience gained by public organisations and [PRAVDA reads: the experience of work gained by labor collectives, party, Soviet, and economic organs, public organizations and] leading cadres in conditions of restructuring.

We badly need answers to many burning problems restructuring has raised or will raise, I think. We must help all to change their ways more quickly in the spirit of the time. As V.I. Lenin said, this organising function of the press should be strengthened from day to day and it should learn in practice to be a collective agitator, propagandist and organiser of the masses.

There is one more question that must be made clear. We say that in Soviet society there should be no zones closed to criticism. This refers in full measure to the mass media.

Comrades, there can be no real democracy outside the law or above the law. The 27th congress of the party laid down the main guidelines for the development of our legislation and for strengthening law and order. A great amount of work is to be done in the current five-year plan period to prepare and adopt new laws connected with the development of the economy, the social sphere and culture, the socialist self-government of the people and broadening of guarantees for the rights and liberties of citizens.

The Political Bureau has supported a proposal for drafting new criminal legislation in the near future. The task set is to make it meet more fully the present conditions of development of Soviet society, defend more effectively the interests and rights of citizens and help strengthen discipline, law and order. We must consider and adopt measures to raise the role and prestige of the Soviet court, strictly observe the principle of independence of judges, resolutely strengthen the procutator's supervision and improve the work of investigating bodies.

A draft law has been prepared on procedure for filing a complaint with a court against illegal actions of officials, infringing the rights of a citizen, and is soon to be submitted for discussion. Additional steps are planned to improve the work of state arbitration and broaden propaganda about the law.

Speaking of democratisation of Soviet society -- which is a matter of principle to us -- it is opportune to underline once more the main, distinguishing, feature of socialist democratism.

What I have in view is an organic combination of democracy and discipline, of independence and responsibility, of the rights and duties of officials, of every citizen.

Socialist democracy has nothing in common with permissiveness, irresponsibility, anarchy. Real democracy serves every person, protecting his political and social rights, and it simultaneously serves every collective and society as a whole, upholding their interests.

Democratisation of all spheres of life in Soviet society is important first of all because we link with it the further development of working people's initiative and the use of the entire potential of the socialist system. We need democratisation in order to move ahead, in order to ensure that legality grows stonger and justice triumphs in society and that a moral atmosphere, in which man can freely live and fruitfully work, is asserted in it.

Comrades, it is well-known that the effectiveness of real democracy depends on how far it stems from the interests of the broad masses, relies on them and is supported by all segments and groups of society.

In this respect, too, the tasks of restructuring make it necessary for us to analyse once more our reserves and possibilities for further broadening the social basis of democracy. The pertinence of such an approach to the question is obvious.

All our experience teaches us that in a period of change, when tackling the most difficult and boldest tasks, the party has invariably turned to the Komsomol, to youth, to their enthusiasm and dedication to the cause of socialism, their inacceptance of stagnation and their commitment to progress. And today when we speak of the need for democratic changes, for broadening the real participation of the people in solving the tasks of restructuring, the question of the position taken by the younger generation is assuming tremendous political significance.

I should like to repeat once more at the plenum: we can be proud of our youth, we pay tribute to its work -- this is factually true and politically correct.

But the time requires everyone to display still greater energies. And, of course, young people, who are interested in restructuring, should be more active. It is they who will live and work in a renovated society. Party organisations, their committees and the Komsomol should open up a perspective before the younger generation and act so as to ensure that young people indeed become energetic participants in the changes. It is from these positions that we should also approach preparations for the next congress of the Young Communist League.

In our work with the Komsomol we should give more attention to the labour, politico-ideological and moral education of young people, to act quicker and with greater resolve in getting rid of everything extraneous in our work with youth, especially in eliminating the didactic tone and administrative methods. Yes, all this exists and mention of it should be made. Whatever lies behind this approach -- disbelief in the reasonableness and maturity of the social aspirations and actions of young people, a simple desire to play safe or soften life's difficulties for our children -- one cannot but agree with such a position.

No, comrades, there is no other realistic way to form a personality, to mould a young person's civic position that his of her own involvement in all public affairs. There can be no substitute for practical experience. That is why it is important to alter the present situation. What exactly do I have in mind?

Above all -- more trust in young people, combining appropriate assistance and freedom of comradely criticism of mistakes, more independence for them in organising their work, studies, daily life, leisure, and more responsibility for their undertakings and actions.

And this also presupposes for them the right to take part in governing society at all levels.

One important aspect of the democratisation of public life is promotion of non-party comrades to leading positions. This is a question of principle. One of the firm guarantees of the health and progress of socialist society lies in the political and professional growth of the front-ranking worker, farmer, engineer, researcher, doctor, teacher, public services employee, in constantly pushing to the fore and promoting talents from among the people.

Sometimes one hears the opinion that the question of promotion of non-party people has become outdated because the CPSU now has over 19 million members. I think this is erroneous. To proceed from such a concept means to deform the party's relations with the masses and, moreover, putting it straight, to infringe on the constitutional rights of citizens and thus limit our opportunities as regards cadres.

We have had, and still have quite a few remarkable examples of fruitful work by non-party comrades in leading positions. They head mills and factories, collective and state farms, construction organisations, scientific and pedagogical collectives, engineering services and are actively involved in public activities.

Open selection of people to be promoted -- both from among communists and non-party people -- will meet the aims of democratisation and help attract broad masses of the working people into administration.

There is also the question of promoting more women to leading positions. There are many successful working women in party and state posts, in science, health care, education, culture, the light industry, trade, and public services. It meets our country's needs today to more actively involve women in running the economy, culture on an all-union or republic scale. We have the possibility, all we have to do is trust and support women.

Comrades, there is not a single fundamental issue that we could resolve, now or in the past, without taking into account the fact that we live in a multiethnic country.

There is hardly any need to prove the importance of socialist principles in the development of relations between the nationalities. It is socialism that did away ith national oppression and inequality and any infringement on the rights of people on grounds of nationality and ensured the economic and cultural progress of all nations and nationalities, in short, the successes of our party's nationalities policy are beyond any doubt and we can rightly take pride in them.

But we must also see the real picture of relations between the nationalities and the prospects for their development. Now that democracy and self-government are growing more extensive, now that there is a fast growth of the national awareness of all nations and nationalities and processes of internationalisation are growing deeper, it is especially important to settle quickly and fairly questions arising on the one possible basis -- in the interests of the progress of each nation and nationality, in the interests of their drawing closer together in future, in the interests of society as a whole.

And in this connection it must be said that negative phenomena and deformations we have been combatting have also manifested themselves in the sphere of relations between nationalities. Now and then there have been manifestations of parochialism, tendencies towards ethnic isolation, sentiments of ethnic arrogance and even incidents similar to those which took place quite recently in Alma-Ata.

The events in Alma-Ata and what had preceded them call for a serious analysis, for a principled assessment. All this is yet to be thoroughly examined. But it is clear already today: What has happened should compel not only Communists in Kazakhstan, but all party organizations and their committees to face up to the problems of the further development of national relations, of enhancing internationalist education. It is especially important to save the rising generation from the demoralizing effect of nationalism.

V.I. Lenin taught "to be able to be an internationalist in deed", and it is our duty not to interrupt this study.

All of our experience shows: Nationalist trends can be successfully opposed by consistent, sustained internationalism. Everything that we have accomplished is thanks to concerted effort.

If one region produces oil, another one provides it with bread. Those who grow cotton receive machines. Each ton of bread, each gram of gold, each ton of cotton, coal and oil, and each machine -- from the simplest to the most sophisticated -- contain a particle of labour of all Soviet people, of the entire country, of our whole multi-national union.

The entire atmosphere of our life and concerted work, the family and school, the Army, culture, literature and arts are called upon to shape and inculcate in Soviet people of all nationalities, above all the youth, the noblest feelings, those of internationalism and Soviet patriotism.

Acting in the spirit of Leninist requirements, in the spirit of the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress, it is necessary to follow firmly the line of all nations and ethnic groups of the country being represented in party, state and economic bodies, including at all-union level, so that the composition of the leading cadres most fully reflect the country's national structure.

Naturally, the point at issue is not a mechanical allocation of jobs and posts according to the national principle -- this would mean the vulgarization of the very idea of internationalism. Political, practical and moral qualities are what determine in all instances the image of the worker. Besides, one should not disregard the particular delicacy of national aspects in one problem or another, folk traditions in the way of life, in people's psychology and behaviour. All this should be taken into account in the most careful way.

I ought to mention, comrades, that some leaders at times approach the solution of questions connected with relations between nationalities without due responsibility.

From time to time there emerge misunderstandings in relations between neighbouring districts or regions of various republics. At times, they flare up into disputes escalating even into litigation, while the heads of party and local government bodies shirk principled solutions rather than prevent or abate the passions. Political workers ought to be able to act in such situations and cool unhealthy emotions.

Our theoretical thought is greatly indebted to the practice of national relations. I mean the apparently insufficient analysis of nationalities policy issues that would correspond to the present stage of the country's development. It is a fact, comrades, that instead of conducting objective research into real phenomena in the sphere of national relations and analysis of the actual socio-economic and cultural processes -- very complicated and contradictory in their essence -- some of our social scientists have for long preferred to create upbeat [PRAVDA places quotation marks around: upbeat] treatises reminiscent at times of complimentary toasts rather than serious scientific studies.

One should admit that the errors which were allowed to occur in the sphere of national relations and their manifestations remained in the shadow and it was not accepted practice to mention them. This has resulted in the negative consequences with which we are now dealing.

We stressed at the 27th congress the invariability of our party's tradition that was initiated by V.I. Lenin: to display special tact and care in everything that concerns the development of national relations, that affects the interests of each nation and ethnic group and people's national feelings, and to resolve in a timely way questions emerging in this sphere.

It is in the traditions of bolshevism to wage a principled struggle against any manifestations of nationalist narrow-mindedness and boastfulness, nationalism and chauvinism, preference of local to state interests, Zionism and anti-Semitism -- no matter what their form might be. We ought to bear in mind that nationalism and proletarian internationalism are two oposite policies, two opposing world outlooks.

Proceeding from these positions, we shall be firm and principled. People's national sentiments deserve respect, they should not be ignored, but they should not be flirted with either. Let those who would like to play on nationalist or chauvinistic prejudices entertain no illusions and expect no loosening up.

Principles, comrades, are principles precisely because they are not to be forgone. No doubt, this position -- the principled, Leninist position -- will be backed by the entire party, by the entire multi-national Soviet people.

III. Personnel Policy in Conditions of Reorganization

Comrades,

I think that we all realize full well that success of reorganization depends to a decisive extent on how fast and profound our cadres' perception will be of the need for changes, how constructive and purposeful their effort will be in implementing the party's policy. What is necessary today is a personnel policy to match the tasks of reorganization, the need for accelerating social and economic development. In formulating its initial requirements, we ought to take into account both the lessons of the past and the new large-scale tasks life poses today.

The years of socialist construction in the country saw the formation of a powerful potential of highly skilled personnel, while the immeasurably improved level of education and culture of workers and peasants, of the entire people create favourable conditions for its constant replenishment and renewal. Everything that we have accomplished, everything that we have attained is the result of Soviet people's work and is due to our cadres' selfless effort.

At the same time one should also mention at this plenum mistakes in work with cadres, distortions in personnel policy that have occurred in recent years and resulted in major shortcomigs in the activity of several links of the party, state and economic apparatus and in negative phenomena in society. Many errors could have been avoided if party bodies had always pursued in a consistent way a principled, effective personnel policy and ensured the high efficiency of all links of the party leadership and economic management.

Of course, one should not limit oneself today to the mere admission of mistakes. In order to avoid such miscalculations in the future, we ought to draw lessons from the past.

What are these lessons?

The first one is the need to resolve in good time personnel questions that accumulate within the party Central Committee, its Politburo -- above all from the viewpoint of ensuring continuity in the leadership and its renewal.

The violation of this natural process resulted at a certain stage in the weakening of the capacity for work of the Politburo and the Secretariat, and the CPSU Central Committee as the whole, its apparatus, and also the government.

Indeed, comrades, following the April plenum a large part of the Secretariat and heads of departments in the CPSU Central Committee have been replaced [PRAVDA here adds: in a short time], practically the entire composition of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers has been renewed. This change was a forced one, since renewal of the composition of the Central Committee and the government and their constant replenishment with new cadres had not been ensured for a long time, as life demanded. All this ultimately affected the elaboration of policy and the practical work of the party in guiding society.

This cannot and should not be repeated.

In order to prevent the breaching of the process of renewal and the disruption of continuity, the CPSU Central Committee, the Politburo and the Secretariat of the Central Committee, the government, the top echelons of the party and state leadership should be open for the influx of fresh forces from various spheres of activity. Raising the question in this way fully corresponds to the Leninist understanding of personnel policy, to the interests of the party and the people.

Of course, the party Central Committee has carried out a great deal of work and continues to do so. But the level of this work should never, under any circumstances, be allowed to go down. On the contrary, it should constantly grow and meet the demands advanced by life, by the development of society and the international situation. Any weakening in the Central Committee's activity is impermissible.

The CPSU Central Committee is called upon to be a model of the implementation of Lenin's ideas, principles and methods in work. Our plenums should discuss truly principal issues of party life, the country's domestic and international situation. They should be discussed in a free, frank way, with the sense of profound responsibility, in an atmosphere of ideological cohesion and broad comparison of viewpoints.

In this connection I want to emphasize the role of Central Committee members, their rights and responsibility. During plenums, each Central Committee member should be guaranteed the right to raise questions and participate in their collective constructive discussion. In the party -- the more so at plenums of the Central Committee -- there can be no persons outside criticism or people with no right to criticise.

There are many things we will have to rectify here. Let us say honestly: There were many crucial problems of concern to the party and the people that remained outside plenum agendas for several years. Comrades will remember the plenums of the Central Committee were [PRAVDA here adds: frequently] brief and formal. Many Central Committee members had no opportunity throughout their membership term to participate in debates or even put forward proposals. Such an atmosphere at the plenum of the Central Committee told upon the style of work of local party committees and organizations.

The second lesson out of past experience, comrades, is that we should not allow any underestimation of political and theoretical training, of the ideological and moral tempering of cadres.

Otherwise, there occur most serious disruptions in the activity of party committees as bodies of political leadership.

These criteria in the selection, placement and education of personnel were not always taken into account in recent years. Not infrequently, prime attention was given to a functionary's knowledge of the specifics of one branch of production or another, of science and engineering, technology, or his will power.

All that, undoubtedly, has importance. But one should not allow that such qualities in managerial staff as their ideological and theoretical outlook and political maturity, moral standards and the capacity to persuade and lead people be dropped from the field of vision.

One should admit directly and honestly that the technocratic, "administrative-pressure" style of work inflicted substantial damage to the party cause, above all to work with people which is the principal element in the party's activity. In plunging into economic work and assuming in several instances functions not properly pertaining to them, many party functionaries reduced [PRAVDA here adds: attention] to political issues, to phenomena of social significance in the sphere of the economy, in social and cultural life.

Of course, objective causes, too, underlie such style. They are connected with a number of unresolved economic management issues and with the lack of an effective economic mechanism. In this situation many party committees, aware of their responsibility and their duty before the people, have to take upon themselves the solution of a large number of economic problems. This has been happening for a number of years. It has struck deep root in the style and methods of work, and led to a certain deformation in the principles of party guidance and in the very composition of our personnel.

Large-scale measures to restructure management and the economic mechanism in the country open up wide opportunities for refining the work of the party committees and organisations, enhancing party influence in all spheres of the life of society and practising a political approach to all problems under construction.

I want to emphasise that no one can relieve party committees of their concern and responsibility for the state of affairs in the economic field. As I have already stated, the point in question is, such an improvement of the methods of party guidance as would rule out substitution and petty tutelage over economic bodies.

The third lesson we must learn is that two opposite tendencies paradoxically existed in the personnel policy in recent years. You may ask what I mean, comrades.

On the one hand, the phenomena of stagnancy have manifested themselves rather strongly among the personnel corps. The necessary personnel changes have not occurred, at times for decades, and there has been no influx of new people into the positions of secrtaries of a number of party committees, and into soviets and economic bodies at the local, republic and all-union levels.

Speaking of that, I do not want to cast the slightest aspersions on many hundreds and thousands of marvelous workers, particularly at the district and city levels, who have always devoted all their energies and knowledge to selflessly servicing the party and the people. Years of honest work and their truly deserved prestige reaffirm their right to hold executive positions. The CPSU and the people highly value their persevering effort, their great services, and give them due credit for that.

I think that the well-known and, moreover, the well-assimilated thesis that personnel stability is necessary in principle does not need additional proofs, but it should not be carried to extremes, to the point of absurdity, if you will.

We know all too well what this led to and what price is now being paid for that and for artificial stability [PRAVDA reads: what price is still being paid even now for artifical stability], which has essentially turned into personnel stagnancy.

On the other hand, there also existed another, no less disquieting, tendency in the work with personnel, particularly at the primary level of the economy. It is a question of high personnel turnover, a real reshuffling of directors of industrial enterprises, construction projects, collective and state farms and other organisations.

You know how great the role of highly qualified organisers of production is. The leaders of work collectives -- communists and non-party people -- are the party's main support in the pursuance of its socio-economic policy. They shoulder a great number of most diverse tasks. In this case I want to ask one question: How could it happen that the leading personnel of work collectives changed completely within several years in many districts and regions?

This can only happen when actual work with personnel and real concern for their political and professional growth and for rendering them practical assistance are pushed to the background and are replaced by administration by decree, by hasty and at times rash judgements of their activities and capabilities.

I think that the party committee should take this very serious reproach as referring to themselves and draw the right conclusion.

Unfortunately, there are also party committees and secretaries who cover up their own blunders and, sometimes, failures with ostentatious exactingness towards personnel, by pseudo-adherence to principle without regard for either the essence of the matter or the fate of the people involved.

In this connection I want to speak of yet another inadmissible phenomenon. I mean the intolerance of some executives to independent actions and thinking on the part of subordinates. It happens quite often that as soon as some worker begins to express independent opinions which do not coincide with those of the secretary of a party committee, the head of a ministry or department, enterprise, institution or organisation, attempts are made to get rid of him under any pretext, at times even under outwardly plausible ones.

This seems better, but better for whom or for what? For the work? Nothing of the kind. It is always worse for the work.

In this respect, too, we should learn from Vladimir Lenin, who, like no one else, could bring people together, ensure concerted effort, support resourceful people, and attentively hear out party comrades and, if necessary, patiently make them change their mind. We should learn to be principled, exacting, and attentive.

The fourth lesson of our work with personnel is to enhance responsibility for the work assigned, to tighten discipline, to create an atmosphere of mutual exactingness. How could it happen, comrades, that many leading positions were held for decades -- at the district, city, regional, republic, and even all-union levels -- by executives who could not cope with their duties, by undependable and undisciplined people?

The consequences are well known. For years a number of sectors, among them ferrous metallurgy, the coal industry, railway transport, machine tool manufacture, agricultural engineering, the meat-and-dairy industry, to name some, were headed by executives who were failing to accomplish the assigned tasks.

Everyone ostensibly knew about that. The state of affairs in those sectors was quite often criticised at sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at plenary meetings of the Central Committee and even at party congresses. But everything remained unchanged.

Are not there regions, republics, cities and districts where production targets have not been met for years, and where social matters have been neglected? At the same time, their leaders did not bear any responsibility for failures in work. They got away with it all.

The same can be said about some directors of enterprises, economic organisations, health care, educational, scientific, and cultural institutions, and the news media: They have long neglected their work, cannot cope with their duties, and instead are masters at throwing dust in people's eyes and are complacent in their attitudes. Only recently this turned out to be enough for them to retain their positions.

It also happens that certain executives find themselves in the wrong position and are in no way up to mark. Their misfortune is that they have got that post and work that is beyond them. What should be done in such cases?

It seems that it is essential to admit such errors, to rectify them, and without dramatising them, to assign the person concerned to a job which would correspond to his abilities.

We should not and cannot be 'kind' at the expense of the interests of the party, society, and the people. The party and people's interests are above everything else. Such is our unshakeable law. The real concern for personnel has nothing in common with complacency and all-forgiveness, philanthropy and flirting. We should assimilate this lesson well, too.

And, finally, about yet another lesson. It is natural to raise this question at our plenary meeting: Why have all these problems that have piled up in the work with personnel remained for a long time unattended and unresolved? How could it happen? This question, as you well understand, is very serious.

The Political Bureau's opinion is that the main cause is in laxity in adherence to democratic principles in the work with personnel. In a principled way I have already spoken of inner-party democracy as the chief guarantor of the realisation of the party's strategic course and the reorganization tasks.

Proposals on such a cardinal question of democratisation as the formation of elective bodies within the CPSU were expressed as well.

Now I would like to single out the question of raising the role of all elective bodies. It must be admitted at once that if they acted properly as they should, both within the party and in the state, in trade unions and other public organisations, many serious omissions in the work with personnel could have been avoided.

Let us have a look at life with open eyes, so to say. An excessive growth of the role of executive bodies to the detriment of elective ones has occurred. At first glance everything proceeds as it should. Plenary meetings, sessions and meetings of other elective bodies are regularly held. But their work is often overformalised. Secondary questions or even those decided upon in advance are brought up for discussion. As a result, there is a lack of due control over the activities of executive bodies and their leading personnel. Let's face it, some comrades started to view elective bodies as a certain burden which brings only difficulties and hindrances. This is how far the matters have gone.

That resulted in the decreased role of the deputies of the soviets, of members of party and other collective decision-making bodies in the formation of executive committees, in the selection of personnel, and in control over their activities. Is not the same evidenced by the character and style of relationships between the salaried staff and members of elective bodies? Quite often one can come across attempts by staff members to command the members of party committees, other public organisations and deputies of the soviets. In actual fact it turns out that democratic mechanisms for the formation and functioning of the elective bodies are proclaimed but by no means always function and, consequently, are not effective enough.

This is why, returning again to what was said about the development of socialist democracy in the conditions of reorganisation, I want to emphasise once again the topicality and immense importance of the formulated proposals on these matters. We should work out and take such measures which would ensure a decisive role of collective decision-making, elective bodies.

No executive body, the less so its staff, cannot, has no right to substitute for the elected one or to domineer over it. [PRAVDA reads: No executive body, still less its apparatus, can substitute of has the right to substitute for the elected one or to domineer over it.]

The necessary prerequisites -- political and legal -- should be created for the elected bodies to exercise effective control over the executive staff, its formation and activities. This will be a reliable safeguard against many errors, including those in the work with personnel.

I think the participants in the plenary meeting are well aware of the entire fundamental importance of putting this question in this way and of the need to urgently solve it.

One of the causes of serious omissions in the work with personnel is the weakening of the role of control bodies both within the party and in the sphere of state and public organisations. They did not pay attention to many reports about abuses and violations in a number of regions and branches of the national economy, in party committees of regions, territories and republics.

The work of the control bodies was often confined to superficial checks and formal financial inspections, examination of various complaints and minor human conflicts. These questions, certainly, also command attention, but reducing work to them is inadmissible, especially now.

The 27th Congress of the CPSU has given a new direction to the activities of the control bodies. It is important that all of them, beginning with the district and ending with the national ones should live up to their lofty prupose, show an example of principledness and fairness.

In general terms, Comrades, we cannot and should not repeat the mistakes of the past. In addition, I think, nobody will allow us to do so.

Such are the main lessons of the personnel policy about which, in the opinion of the Political Bureau, it is necessary to report to the plenary meeting.

The main conclusion from them is that we must seriously renew our personnel policy, free it from distortions and oversights, make it truly contemporary, more active and purposeful, inseparably link it with the key trends in the effort to accelerate socio-economic development.

I repeat that the point atn issue is not just a perfection of the organization of the work with cadres, but of outlining a personnel policy according with the tasks of the reorganization. It is only with such a broad approach that work with the cadres will serve towards carrying out deep-going and revolutionary change.

V.I. Lenin taught us to approach the work with personnel above all politically, view it in inseparable connection with the essence of the problems being resolved at the given stage and select personnel "by the new standards, according to the new tasks".

What does that mean as applied to the present-day stage in social development?

The attitude of the cadres to restructuring, to the tasks of accelerating the country's socio-economic development, attitude not in words, but in deeds is today the decisive criterion in the personnel policy, some kind of a yardstick to measure it. We must certainly take into the account the fact that the formation and activity of cadres have proceeded for a long time not in the best conditions. That is why change does not come easily.

We are in for painstaking and persistent work to readjust the cadres body.

We have resolutely taken the course of supporting enterprising, thinking and energetic people, who can and wish to forge ahead boldly and are capable of ensuring success. We have many of them. The decisions of the April plenary meeting and of the 27th congress have lent them wings and given broad scope for creative activities. Look how the talent has been revealed again [PRAVDA reads: revealed in a new way] strikingly and powerfully of such economic managers as Vladimir Kabaidze from Ivanovo, Boris Fomin from the Leningrad "Electrosila" Works, Anatoliy Parshin from the Taganrog "Krasny Kotelshchik" Works, Iran Frantsenyuk from the Novolipetsk Metallurgical Works, Raisa Roshchinskaya, director of the Novocherkassk Clothing Factory, Yuriy Baranov, director of the Donetsk Mine Administration "Sotsialisticheskiy Donbass", Nikolay Travkin, head of Trust No. 18 of the "Mosoblselstroi" Amalgamation, Aleksandr Duduk, director of the Belorussian state farm complex "Mir", Mikhail Klepikov, a well-known team leader from Kuban, chairmen of collective farms -- Vasiliy Gorin from Belgorod Region, Nikolay Tereshchenko from Stavropol territory, Mikhail Wagin fropm Gorkiy Region and Yuriy Bugakov from Novosibirsk Region, and many, many others.

We must learn to support in every way possible such workers, value their independence and initiative. It is important to create in every party organization, in every work collective, an atmosphere that would stimulate all to a search for effective decisions, a most open and frank exchange of views. It goes without saying that it is necessary to resolutely get rid of such methods as dressing down [PRAVDA here adds: telling off, and reprimanding], which are often used even to this day. We are for reorganization but not for a shake-up of the cadres. It is necessary, Comrades, to respect people and trust them more.

Today everyone has the opportunity to display his or her abilities. And we must assist those who wish to work both with advice and comradely exactingness. Yet we are going a different way than those who cling tenaciously to the old, remaining indifferent to current changes or even oppose them.

Thus the attitude towards the reorganization and real actions for its implementation are decisive in the approach to the appraisal of cadres. [paragraph continues]

We must certainly take into account other basic qualities. I mean, first and foremost, an uncompromising attitude towards shortcomings, routine, towards indifference and passiveness, and a commitment to everything that is advanced and progressive.

Restructuring requires of the workers competence and high professional standards. Today one cannot do without up-to-date know-how and all-round preparedness, without profound knowledge of production, science and technology, administration, the economy, organization of work and incentives, psychology. In general terms, we must put the country's intellectual potential to maximum use and considerably increase its creative effectiveness.

Organizational standards and discipline are assuming increasingly greater significance. They are always necessary everywhere, but are especially important in conditions of modern production, with the broad application of the latest technologies. In recent years there has been a noticeable increase in the economic growth rates after setting things in [PRAVDA here adds: elementary] order and dealing with carelessness.

Yet this task remains urgent. Loose discipline and a lowering of responsibility are too deeply rooted and are felt painfully to this day. It is precisely criminal irresponsibility and carelessness which are the main causes of such tragic events as the accident at the Chernobly nuclear power plant, the sinking of the "Admiral Nakhimov", a number of air and railway accidents, which involved human casualties.

It is necessary to create everywhere an atmosphere that would exclude every possibility of a repetition of such occurrences. Discipline, promptness and efficiency [PRAVDA reads: Organization, punctiliousness, and efficiency] should become the law for everybody.

At last, the most important demand is the high moral standard of our cadres, such human qualities as honesty, incorruptibility and modesty. We now know not only from the past but also from recent experience that we would not be able to resolve the tasks involved in reorganization without strengthening society's moral health. It is not coincidental that we have so painfully encountered negative phenomena today in the moral and ethical sphere. I mean the effort to eradicate drunkenness, embezzlement, bribery, abuse of office and protectionism [PRAVDA reads: office and favoritism].

Everything that is connected with the moral image of party members, above all of senior executives, is perceived particularly keenly in society. Our paramount objective is to restore the untarnished and honest image of communist leaders at all levels, an image lessened to a certain extent by the crimes of a number of renegades.

In general, Comrades, taking into account the demands of the times we will have to resolutely readjust work with the cadres in all branches of the economy, in all areas of social life, in all echelons of the leadership, both in the centre and in the provinces.

The Political Bureau interprets the essence and the main objective of the present-day personnel policy first and foremost as increasing demands made by the party of its own self, of its cadres. Deepening the reorganization of society means rebuilding the work done by the party and its cadres at all levels -- from the Central Committee to primary organizations. This means creatively comprehending and consistently pursuing Lenin's principles and norms of party life in all sectors.

How is reorganization proceeding in the party? What example is set by the party committees, party leaders and activists?

Today we can say that most party committees and their leaders have taken up this work with great sense of responsibility and a sincere desire for change. They are not yet able to cope with many things, but they are accumulating experience and acting more decisively with every passing day. These changes create reliable prerequisites for speeding up our advance.

All the party cadres are going through the test of reorganization. But they handle it differently. A visible gap has formed between those who are forging ahead with determination, and those who are marking time.

The school of reorganization does not come easy to some party leaders. They cannot yet give up the dispatcher functions [PRAVDA reads: Control (dispetcherskiye) functions] so unnatural for party committees, the wish to decide all questions for everyone and keep a tight grip on things. But this, as always, hampers growth in the responsibility of the cadres for the work they have been entrusted with, the development of their initiative and independence.

Instead of developing innovative thinking, party officials quite often react adversely to the initiative and activeness of people and view them as almost a natural calamity. But the paramount duty of the party committees in the conditions of reorganization is to guide the creativity of the masses, help people eliminate shortcomings and get down to work as soon as possible.

Yet is necessary at the same time to warn comrades against artificially speeding up events and putting the cart before the horse.

Reorganization and speed-up of our advance are based on the objective laws of the development of society. But as in every social movement, the role of the subjective individual aspect is sufficiently great here too. Its influence can be either positive or negative. Therefore it is highly important that the process of renovation, which quite sensibly affects human lives, be reliably protected from relapses of administration by injunction and a mechanical approach to matters at hand. A devaluation of the notion of reorganisation cannot be allowed anywhere, not in a single sector of our social and production system. One must see and react immediately, when timeserving [PRAVDA here adds: personal ambition,] and self-seeking are appearing under its banner, when true restructuring is replaced with high-sounding phrases, verbosity.

I wish to repeat that without developing democracy, without the broad participation of the working people we will not be able to cope with the tasks involved in reorganization.

The party committees and all cadres should learn to work in conditions marked by increasing democracy and growing political and labour activity by the people.

There have been many occasions to become convinced that the process of change tends to have a stronger momentum when the district and city party committees are more energetic and work in the new manner. This is only understandable. They are the closest to the primary party organisations and work collectives and hence to the frontline of the struggle to speed up the country's social and economic development. Most of these committees have taken the right stands and begun executing the party's policy of change resolutely and consistently.

Yet an analysis of the way things are standing at local level, articles in the press, and letters by working people to the party's Central Committee indicate that there still are quite a few city and district party committees whose staff keep to the old ways, act in the old fashion and remain on the sidelines of the drive for renewal.

Even if this was limited to just one city committee or a district committee, that still could not be ignored. But this is something wide-spread and so must, comrades, make us concerned. In many cases this kind of situation in the city and district party committees is explained by the style and methods of work and by the positions of their secretaries.

I think we will do right if we pay more attention to this highly important party echelon and help the district and city committees adopt a more active stand for change as soon as possible. The primary party organizations then will also work still better and lead the work collectives to the set goals. We see how the communists' activity is steadily growing and how inertia and formalism are gradually receding from the work of party organisations. But there is still a great deal to be done also in this respect. The primary party organisations need efficient aid and support.

Comrades, immense responsibility for effectuating the strategic policy of a speedup in social and economic development lies with economic executives. A changeover is currently under way in the country from administrative to economic methods of management and to a responsible and resourceful manner of approaching the business at hand.

The staffs of factories and amalgamations today are being provided with large funds and amounts of materials and equipment to modernise their production facilities and solve social issues. The managers are being granted broad rights not only to make whatever tactical economic manoeuvres are expedient but also to pursue long-term aims within the five-year-plan period and beyond. In short, a new economic, social and political situation is developing, in which an energetic and competent executive can reveal his abilities well.

Most economic executives support the far-reaching measures launched by the party and the government to reform the system of management and are joining in their implementation ever more actively.

We can already see a positive head start in many useful initiatives.

The experience of Leningrad and Kharkov in converting factories to working in shifts is catching on and bringing the first benefits.

In Leningrad and its region virtually all leading factories have been switched over to two- or three-shift operation. This has made it possible to increase the number of afternoon-shift workers by almost 50,000. Fixed assets are now being used more efficiently and updated more quickly. It has become possible to release 350,000 square meters of shopfloor space for other uses and slash the need for new building by 120,000 square meters. According to preliminary estimates, all this will help save over 100 million roubles in capital outlays, most of which could then be spent on housing construction and the provision of other social amenities.

The managers and specialists of the factories and amalgamations which have followed the example of the Vaz Auto Factory and the Frunze Machine-Building Amalgamation in Sumy to go completely on a pay-your-own-way basis [PRAVDA reads: to go completely over to financial autonomy and self-financing] from the start of this year have been initiating much innovation.

Interesting experience in mastering new managerial methods has been gained by the Belorussian and several other railways, helping to improve the performance of the rail service in general and raise worker productivity there.

Work collectives in a number of regions in the Ukraine have displayed business gumption and enterprise by launching a broad-based drive for resource conservation.

The initiative of mine- and foundry-worker teams looking for, and tapping, latent reserves to meet their targets ahead of schedule also deserves to be supported.

Work collectives in Sverdlovsk, Lipetsk and some other cities have been showing a good example of how to go about tackling the housing and other social problems.

The acreage under grain and a number of other crops cultivated by means of industrial technology has been on the increase. Brigades operating on the basis of team contracts and economic accountability are being formed at collective farms and state farms and helping quickly increase agricultural production and make the economy more cost-effective.

Yet it must be said frankly: The process of the mastering by cadres of modern economic management methods and approaches to work is proceeding with difficulty, in a contradictory manner, and not without painful phenomena and relapses of the past.

The introduction of state quality control is a patent example. Understanding the immense importance of this measure many collectives have prepared well for work in the new conditions. And they are getting on with this, though not without difficulties, labour discipline is strengthening and the quality of output improving.

But there are also those who failed to match the high requirements. Instead of rolling up their sleeves and getting down to improving quality they began scaring themselves and others with possible complications, conflict situations and even stoppages of factories.

Comrades, I am far from simplifying the situation. But one thing is clear: We communists, all Soviet people cannot any longer put up with a situation when many enterprises for years are putting out products that are hopelessly obsolete and come under serious criticism of consumers and hold back the country's scientific and technological progress.

We are tackling a big task and are obliged to see it through to the end.

The transition to the cost-benefit methods of economic management, the expansion of the rights of amalgamations and enterprises create a new situation for ministries and agencies. We already discussed questions of changing their style and methods of work at the June 1986 plenary meeting of the Central Committee.

What has been done since?

Changes in the work of ministries and agencies are taking place, even though slowly and painfully. These headquarters of the economy's various branches are taking a direct part in drafting proposals on switching enterprises to new conditions of management.

They are giving more attention to questions of scientific and technological policy, the reconstruction of enterprises and starting the output of goods in line with modern demands.

We have strengthened some branches and their subunits with capable people. As a rule, energetic specialists wishing to run things in a new way and ensure the introduction of modern work methods have been placed in senior posts. This policy should be continued, the performance of the staff of ministries and agencies should be vigorously improved and replenished with highly qualified personnel capable of initiative.

At the same time we continue to encounter instances of red tape and irresponsibility in the work of ministries and agencies to carry out the party's and the government's resolutions.

The staff of ministries and agencies appears to be a captive of old regulations and instructions, acts by inertia and refuses to waive its rights.

It is not the first time, comrades, that we draw the attention of the heads and staff members of ministries and agencies to the need of a radical overhaul of their activity. Thereby a possibility is given to all to join this work and master new approaches to the business at hand.

But it should not be permitted for a ministry or its apparatus to be idle and the more so to impede the restructuring. This warning from the rostrum of the plenary meeting is necessary because this concerns the interests of the state and the people, questions of big policy.

It is apt to recall here Lenin's words that the apparatus exists for policy and not policy for the apparatus. [PRAVDA quotes Lenin's words: "The apparatus exists for policy..., and not policy for the apparatus."]

Cadres are placed in new conditions by the restructuring of external economic activities, the granting to many ministries and associations of the right of direct outlet to the foreign market and the granting to all enterprises of the right to set up direct co-production ties with partners in socialist countries. This is something the branch ministries have sought for years.

But it should be well understood that success in external economic activities is possible only if active use is made of achievements of science and technology, if personnel is adequately trained, if new markets are developed, etc.

The main condition of utilising the new opportunities is to start putting out goods of world standard quality.

After the decisions were adopted much time and effort were spent on various organisational matters, on specifiying rights and duties, and the relations between foreign trade organisations and the branch managerial bodies. But the organisational period has already ended.

Now it is necessary to move efforts to the plane of practical deeds, to start [PRAVDA here adds: more] vigorously the development of ties with all foreign partners, first of all in socialist countries.

I have already had the occasion to say that the success of the strategy of acceleration depends first of all on how we are fulfilling the tasks of scientific and technological progress, on how skilfully we are combining the advantages of socialism with the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution.

The real accomplishments here are determined by the state of scientific knowledge, by the advancement of original ideas that can be incorporated in fundamentally new machines and technologies making it possible to forge ahead along the leading directions of science and technology.

Such is the strategic task set before science by reorganisation.

Everything is important in implementing it -- from enrollment of students at establishments of higher learning, the standard of training specialists to replenishing the Academy of Sciences with talented scientists, from the work of scientific student societies to the research programs of the leading academic and branch institutes, from the creative atmosphere in scientific collectives to the most effective forms of organising and promoting science.

Integration of science with production has now acquired special importance. An important role in this matter is assigned to intersectoral scientific and technical complexes. Over 20 of them have already been established today. It is with the activity of these complexes that we link great hopes for speeding up the development of new ideas and, particularly, for introducing scientific and technical achievements. Therefore it is necessary to give more attention to the work of intersectoral scientific and technical complexes. The Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences and appropriate ministries and departments should provide them will all the necessary facilities, give them all the assistance they need and facilitate in every way their effective work.

Such important issues as efficient coordination of academic, higher-school and sectoral science, integration of efforts by natural, technical and social sciences, integrated nature of research, the depth of treatment of fundamental problems and enhancement of the effectiveness of concrete developments, remain [PRAVDA here adds: acute and] unsolved in many respects.

Addressing, on behalf of the plenum, our scientists and all scientific workers I want to say that for science to be actively involved in the process of restructuring it should restructure itself in many ways. Life is hastening us. He who is not in the lead in scientific ideas is risking to fall back in everything.

That is the way the question is posed by our time, a time of [PRAVDA here adds: the most] profound changes in science and technology, yet unseen by mankind.

This makes it necessary for party committees, ministries and departments and economic organs to face the needs of science which should be always aware of effective support for it. We know that the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences and its President Academician G.I. Marchuk have interesting ideas and proposals on this score. I can assure you that these ideas will find support in the Central Committee and the government.

Prospects for socio-economic, scientific-technological and cultural progress [PRAVDA reads: spiritual progress] are determined in many ways by the education system and the quality of education. We have begun a reform of general-education and vocational schools. As you evidently know, this reform is not a simple thing and therefore it commands unflagging attention along all lines -- from strengthening the material and technical basis of schools to the content, form and methods of teaching and educational process. Decisions have been taken to reorganise higher and specialised secondary education, raise the salaries of higher school faculty members as well as grants for post-graduate and undergraduate students.

All this will create favourable preconditions for an accelerated development of science and production and for the fulfilment of the party congress decisions. We must put them into practice and see to it that high and results are achieved as soon as possible.

The system for advance training [PRAVDA reads: advanced training] and retraining of specialists will be built on a new basis. In present-day conditions of production, the concrete knowledge [PRAVDA here adds: abilities,] and skills of all workers should be continuously increased and improved. The establishment of a state system for uninterrupted education was qualified by the 27th congress as one of the main tasks for us to accomplish. This is the only way to maintain the competence of personnel at the level of present-day demands, especially in new and newest fields of technology and engineering. There is hardly any need to prove how important it is to hasten the preparation of proposals on this question.

Finally, a few words about the tasks of the personnel of our planning, financial and other economic bodies. We must now cardinally reorganise their work with an eye to the objectives of the economic reform.

The economic departments of this country have submitted quite a number of proposals for restructuring management and the economic mechanism. But, frankly speaking, the personnel of these departments are slow to reorganise themselves and, I would say, even fall behind economic transformations in the sphere of production. All the things happening there require considerable changes to be made in the functions of general economic departments and their local organs.

The political directives formulated by the 27th congress should be taken by them as a guide in their work. The aim of the economic reform in the country is both an extensive development of independence for the lower levels of the economy and the further consideration of the principles [PRAVDA reads: principle] of centralism in management with simultaneously freeing the centre from petty tutelage of branches, amalagamations and plants. All personnel, particularly all the leaders of economic departments, should now act precisely in this key and give up old approaches to work.

One more question directly relating to the activities of economic [PRAVDA here adds: and management] cadres. Special attention in the 12th 5-Year Plan is given to the development of the social sphere. This is dictated by the state of affairs in this sphere.

We must close more quickly the existing gap betweeen development levels in the productive and social spheres.

The party congress made serious corrections in political directives on these matters and came to the conclusion that insufficient attention to the social sphere has become one of the factors accounting for the lag in scientific and technological progress and in the growth of production efficiency and hampered the use of the existing potential.

The fact that in the course of long years economic executives were not asked with due strictness to account for the way they dealt with social matters left a serious stamp on their attitude to their work. This situation must be resolutely corrected. It will be difficult to do so without a firm position by party committees and without consistent practical steps on the part of the government.

Let us take a new example. The first stage of the Astrakhan Gas Complex was commissioned towards the end of last year. Over 1.5 billion roubles of capital investments had been absorbed there. There are eight thousand workers and specialists working there but only three thousand of them have permanent housing.

Moreover, the lag in building housing, polyclinics, canteens and other projects of the socio-cultural sphere had been built into plans from the very beginning. Such is the deplorable outcome of the incorrect, mistaken approach to social affairs at the level of planning bodies. The situation is to be righted as soon as possible.

All leading cadres from top to bottom are responsible for conducting a vigorous social policy. [PRAVDA reads: All leading cadres from the lowest to the highest are responsible for implementing the party's active social policy.] Life itself demanded that the interests of man be given top priority in the activity of leading cadres, while the ability to resolve social questions has become one of the chief criteria of their business and political maturity.

Comrades, a great part in implementing the decisions of the 27th congress is attached to local government, trade union, Komsomol and other public organizations, to their personnel. They, too, are facing [PRAVDA here adds: in full measure] the task of restructuring their activity. In effect, the restructuring has already begun.

In what direction should it be continued? This is a question of immense political connotation since the point at issue are very important institutes of our political system. [PRAVDA reads: This is a question of great political connotation, since it concerns very important institutions of our political system.]

In carrying out reorganization, one should bear in mind both the current situation and trends in the development of Soviet society in general, of the political system, socialist democracy and the economic mechanism.

I want to reiterate: The course towards democratization and the establishment of a new mechanism of control and management gives an opportunity to achieve a correct combination of the party's political guidance and the active role of state bodies, trade unions and other public organizations.

We have already adopted fundamental decisions on perfecting the activity of the soviets in the present-day conditions. These decisions enable them to act as true bodies of authority over their territory. Changes in the activity of the soviets are taking place, but they cannot as yet satisfy us. We are all interested in seeing the soviets starting work as soon as possible in earnest, in the spirit of the time.

Party committees ought to take up firmly the course towards enhancing the role of the soviets and not to permit unjustified interference in their affairs, the less so, their substitution [PRAVDA reads: and not permit unjustified interference in their affairs, much less substitute for them]. It is of no less importance that the heads of the soviets, the soviet apparatus start work at full capacity and overcome inertia, the habit to look back all the time at someone and wait for instructions. It is necessary to enhance democratic principles in the activity of the soviets and their executive bodies.

We said at the 27th congress that there are many questions affecting the vital interests of the working people that no one will resolve for the soviets. These are problems of social policy, improvement of consumer services. The soviets, however, have not fully coped with their [PRAVDA reads: fully assimilated their] new rights, do not make due demands on economic managers. This is also one of the reasons why last year's plans were not fulfilled in respect to many indicators of building social and cultural amenities.

Let us take the communal services. Their operation evokes much criticism at present, especially in the conditions of freezing temperatures. But that is the direct and proper business of the soviets. They should drastically alter the work on improving retail trade, consumer services, organization of recreation for working people and consumer goods production, and use more broadly the reserves for replenishing food resources.

We are planning major measures in the field of health services and public education. They are linked most directly with the activity of soviets at various levels. The tasks are building up, so the soviets ought to act with greater efficiency and persistence. This is what we may rightfully demand from the cadres working in the soviets and their apparatus. This is what Soviet people expect from them.

Reorganization -- all its facets -- concerns trade unions. Their rights are substantially expanded with the growth of economic independence of enterprises and amalagamations. Simultaneously, their responsibility is considerably enhanced in connection with bigger powers given to work collectives and the development of self-management. And, naturally, no one relieves the trade unions of their obligations in fulfilling tasks of social policy, in defending the workers' interests.

In brief, the demands on trade union cadres have sharply increased. It is necessary to help them adopt an active stand in reorganization, to create conditions for broader participation in [PRAVDA here adds: managerial] decision-making at all levels.

At present, when the review and election campaign is drawing to an end in trade union organizations and the scheduled congress of the Soviet trade unions in approaching, it is important that the entire complex of topical problems related to reorganization be placed in the focus of attention of the delegates to the congress. Work collectives make up the central link of reorganization. It is there that the trade unions should reveal their potential, should re-assess their capabilities and rights and thus increase their contribution to the national [PRAVDA reads: nationwide (obshchenatsionalnyy)] cause of socio-economic acceleration.

In launching the struggle for improving the health of society [PRAVDA reads: the struggle to improve (ozdorovleniye) society], the party has proceeded since the very beginning from the premise that this immense work should be based on the firm foundation of persuasion. Shaping the consciousness of millions of working people in the spirit of restructuring is one of the key directions of ideological activity.

We have succeeded to a certain extent in bringing ideological work closer to life, to the processes taking place in society today. It is largely due to party organizations, to our propagandists that the ideas of renewal are becoming truly attractive for the masses.

Work on the ideological front is yet to be launched in earnest in many directions, including along the lines of political and economic study, reading of lectures and foreign-policy propaganda, atheistic upbringing and so on.

The Central Committee orients party organizations at drawing all active members of the party, all communists in [PRAVDA reads: into] ideological work. But this in no way removes the tasks of strengthening ideological sections with highly skilled, educated cadres who feel the pulse of the time [PRAVDA reads: cadres who are fully in tune with the pulse of time], who realize full well the essence of the tasks and who are capable of propagating with efficiency the policy of the party, of persuading and organizing people.

The present-day conditions persistently demand that the party's ideological cadres be reinforced with people who know well economics, jurisprudence, philosophy, sociology, literature and the arts, who are deeply convinced of the vital need for the decisions adopted by the 27th congress, for the course towards restructuring.

Comrades, the need for strengthening socialist legality and law and order in the country generate new important tasks to be handled by the cadres of Soviet courts, procuratorate, militia and other law-enforcement agencies.

The Central Committee, attaching great significance to these issues which worry people [PRAVDA reads: attaching tremendeus importance to these questions of concern to society], recently took a special decision "on further strengthening socialist legality and law and order and stepping up protection for the right and legitimate interests of citizens." It has given the law-enforcement agencies and their personnel important and more challenging tasks.

The party committees and local government bodies are duty-bound to make every effort to raise the authority of those working in the courts, procurators' offices, judicial administrations, militia, arbitrage services and notaries' offices and enhance their fidelity to principle, as well as to support voluntary patrolmen helping maintain public order and to promote the spread of legal knowledge.

This position held by the party makes high demands on those standing guard over the law. Letters from working people and complaints from localities point to the fact that there still are quite a few breaches to be found in law-enforcement agencies themselves and that in some areas, to use a popular idiom, they "use cannon to shoot at sparrows," while leaving grave crimes against the interests of our society and citizens unsolved.

We set the law-enforcement personnel the task of undeviatingly abiding by this decision and learning persistently to work amid greater democracy and public openness, relying on the trust and backing of all people.

Now a few words about diplomatic personnel. The activities of the Foreign Ministry are currently being reorganised and the structure of its central apparatus and foreign stations is being readjusted. Senior personnel is being renewed. This line should be pursued consistently and care should be taken to increase the efficiency of diplomatic work and make certain that it fully matches the vigorous international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet State.

The state security service, staffed by ideologically integral [PRAVDA reads: ideologically tempered] and professionally well-trained personnel dedicated to the party and the people, stands vigilantly on guard over the fatherland's interests. We are convinced that the Soviet securtiy [PRAVDA reads: Soviet Chekists] service will continue uncovering hostile intrigues against our country in good time and cutting them decisively short.

Finally, the tasks of the military personnel. The party never slackens its eforts to bolster the country's defense capability and assigns the servicemen a special role in fulfilling this vital task. This determines their immense responsibility to the people.

The Soviet Armed Forces are deeply involved in reorganization as well. They are protecting the peaceful work of the people and the country's security reliably and discharging their internationalist [PRAVDA reads: international] duty with honour.

The Central Committee formly counts on the military personnel, on the Soviet Oficer Corps in strengthening the country's defense capacity. I am positive that in the complicated international situation today the Communists and all Army and Naval personnel will act with complete responsibility [PRAVDA reads: with the greatest responsibility], upgrade their skills, and increase the combat readiness of all arms and service.

The Soviet people and our party count on our Armed Forces. They are doing everything to strengthen them and are entitled to expect no aggressive forces to be able to catch us unawares.

Comrades, in conclusion I would like to speak briefly about the goals for 1987. This year, marking the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, holds special significance for us.

The Soviet people are looking forward to the forthcoming anniversary as they thoroughly reorganise all aspects of public life. The Politburo believes it would be right this year to issue an address to all party members and all working people in the USSR.

The Central Committee calls on Communists, all Soviet people to display a still greater understanding of and a sense of responsibility for what is to be accomplished, for the destiny of the country, for the future image of socialism.

We have achieved much in the decades of socialist construction. But time is putting ever greater demands [PRAVDA reads: putting great new demands] on us. In the changed conditions Soviet society is passing a test of dynamism, of the ability to climb rapidly the steps of progress.

Our economy is passing the test of high efficiency, of receptivity to advanced technologies, of ability to produce first-class output and rival competitors on the world markets.

Our morality, the entire Soviet way of life are being put to test to check their ability to develop steadily and enrich the values of socialist democracy, social justice and humanism.

Our foreign policy is being put to test to check its firmness and consistency in the defence of peace, its flexibility and self-control in conditions of the frenzied arms race fueled by imperialism and the international tension fanned up by it.

In its innermost revolutionary essence, in the Bolshevik audacity of the plans, in its humanistic social purpose, the work being done now is a direct follow up to the great accomplishments started by our Leninist party on October 1917.

The whole world is today looking at the Soviet people: Will we be able to cope with the task? Can we do it? Will we be able to respond in a worthy manner to the challenge thrown to socialism. We have to give a worthy answer by our deeds, by persevering work. And we cannot put it off.

As you understand well, comrades, the year 1987 has a most important role to play in the implementation of the party's speed-up strategy.

The success of the whole five-year plan period, of our most important projects and the fulfillment of long-term plans will depend on how we do that. Hence it is so important to concentrate from the very beginning on specific deeds, on the implementation of the decision taken. Hence it takes work -- painstaking, routine, but extremely important work -- on the part of party committees and organizations, all work collectives on implementing the congress decisions.

We must not only consolidate and develop what we have achieved in the first year of the five-year-plan period in all branches of the economy, in all spheres of life, but also advance further, make fuller use of long-term growth factors. Along all these directions it is imperative to achieve noticeable positive changes and to impart an irrevocable nature to them.

While orienting the cadres at fulfilling the current tasks and definitely fulfilling the assignments of the 12th Five-Year-Plan period we must, as Vladimir Lenin taught us, not lose sight of the perspective, concretize and specify the ways of economic and social progress.

The drafting of the plan for the Thirteenth Five-Year-Plan period will be started shortly on the basis of the new system of management making it possible to utilise socialism's potentialities and advantages to a fuller extent.

Since the ongoing radical reform of economic management concerns fundamental questions of the functioning of the socialist system of economy, as well as many aspects of political and social life, the style and methods of work, it would be expedient to study the entire range of these problems at the Central Committee's next plenary meeting.

In view of these growing tasks, we turn to our cadres. What is required of them is organisation, efficiency in work and the ability to mobilise to the utmost the creative energies and resources of work collectives. Everyone should learn to be able to react quickly and in a businesslike manner to the arising problems and difficulties which naturally may emerge since new and no easy tasks are being tackled. In essence, all of us have to pass an examination in political maturity in mastering new methods of work and of guidance in all sectors of socialist construction.

In short, the new year has brought forth new and quite responsible [PRAVDA reads: highly responsible] tasks in implementing of the general line of the 27th congress. The Political Bureau is convinced that the ideas of the congress, which have been profoundly understood by all our cadres and which have got hold of their minds and thoughts, will more and more persistently and on an ever larger scale make their way into life. They will determine the pace of our development and guarantee that the country will make fundamentally new [PRAVDA reads: qualitatively new] advances in the economic, social and cultural spheres.

It is possible to sum up what has been said as follows: We all, and everyone of us should gear up in our work. The mobilising role of our party, of all its organisations and of all Communists should manifest itself with particular force in the new atmosphere. It is of importance to continuously keep hold of the pulse of life and to do everything for plans to be implemented.

I would like in this connection to take counsel on such a fundamental issue: possibly, it is advisable to convene an all-union party conference next year on the eve of the report-and-election campaign within the party, and extensively to review the course of implementation of the decision of the 27th Congress of the CPSU and to sum up the results of the first half of the five-year plan period. It would be also right for the conference to discuss questions of further democratising the life of the party and society as a whole.

The discussion started at this conference could be continued at report-and-election party meetings and conferences, at which the results of the restructuring work of each party organisation should be analysed in an exacting way.

The very fact of convening an all-union party conference in accordance with the CPSU's rules would become a serious step in democratising in practice our party life and developing Communists' activity.

Comrades, by formulating the personnel policy in conditions of the reorganisation and the acceleration of the country's social and economic development the plenary meeting of the Central Committee thereby determines the most important directions of our work for many years to come.

At the plenum today we constantly turn to Vladimir Ilich Lenin, his thoughts and ideas.

This is not just a tribute of great respect, not only an acknowledgement of Lenin's authority. This reflects the pressing desire to revive in modern conditions and revive to the fullest extent possible the spirit of Leninism, to assert in our life the Leninist demands on cadres. You will recall, comrades, how passionately, how tirelessly Lenin taught that the success of revolutionary struggle, the success of any cardinal restructuring of society is determined in many ways by the mood set by the party.

We wish to turn our country into the model of a highly developed state, into a society with the most advanced economy, the broadest democracy, the most humane and lofty ethics, where the working man would feel that he is master, would enjoy all benefits of material and spiritual culture, where the future of his children would be secure, where he would have everything that is necessary for a full and interesting life. And even sceptics would be forced to say: Yes, the Bolsheviks can accomplish anything. Yes, the truth is on their side. Yes, socialism is a system serving man, working for his benefit, in his social and economic interests, for his spiritual elevation. [PRAVDA concludes with: (the report was listened to with great attention and greeted by prolonged applause)]

Plenum Resumes

LD280721 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 28 Jan 87

[Text] We have just received a report that today in Moscow, at 1000, the CPSU Central Committee plenum continued its work. At the plenum the report of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU, on the restructuring and cadre policy of the party is being discussed.

Plenum Evaluated

LD280652 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 28 Jan 87

[Text] Listen to an interview with a participant in the CPSU Central Committee plenum -- Valentina Nikolayevna Golubeva, twice Hero of Socialist Labor, director of the Ivanovo Kirov Textile Works:

[Golubeva] I would say that the plenum is very serious, specific, constructive, very stern, and directed at long-range prospects.

All of us, the participants, received the report of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev not merely as a package of new, large-scale, strategic tasks for restructuring and the renovation of the party's personnel policy, but also as yet more evidence of the care for the perfection, in essence, of our entire socialist system; care for the creation in the country of the conditions for the successful conversion into life of the socioeconomic transformation elaborated by the 27th party congress.

Many very important issues were raised in the report, such as electing the leading cadres. It is easy to imagine how their responsibility before the collective will rise now, and the main thing is that this will help us get rid of all sorts of pencil pushers, who are today retarding our movement forward. Or the issue of the removability of cadres. We do not need cadre stagnation. But nor do we need cadre leap-frogging, when, graphically speaking, people jump from seat to seat.

And something else. We have all seen that the year since the party congress is marked for the all-round democratization of life. The issue of its continued expansion was posed at the present plenum of CPSU Central Committee. But do all of us see the expansion of rights and freedoms as an achievement of the system? As a manifestation of confidence that needs to be justified day by day? You and I cannot permit anybody to see our democracy as the right to anarchy and demagogy, as the right to have no obligations and to be disorderly.

I believe that exactingness in the conditions of an expanding democracy should not diminish, but grow. Otherwise, sometimes we are just too genial, at the expense of the state. If a person commits an offense, then he has earned punishment. And yet "soft-hearted" -- in quotation marks -- aunts and uncles say Oh, let's forgive him. And, well, then we forgive. We forgive bad workmanship, we forgive the most crude violation of discipline, the breaking of contractual deliveries: as a result, millions of rubles fly from the national treasury due to this all-forgiving virtue. Let us judge one another by specific acts and deeds.